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EVERYBODY WHO IS ANYBODY knows that the class struggle is outmoded, lingering on vestigially only because communists, leftwing unionists and other oldfashioned orthodox working class thinkers stubbornly persist in believing it exists, stirring up alleged grievances and fomenting strikes. This idealist conception of Australian social reality is shared, from quite differing viewpoints, by the conservative establishment which has a vested interest in "abolishing" the class struggle, and some of its radical opponents who consider that economic injustices have almost disappeared in the "affluent society" and are superseded by new moral issues and problems of contemporary capitalism. A whole new concept of social, industrial and political conflicts has emerged, with conservative and radical sides. The conservative theory holds that a new unionism is needed, that concerns itself with sharing in the technological revolution by lifting productivity, co-operating with the new managerial class, a unionism of bright and pushing new experts that will turn its back upon all the old traditions. The new radical theory, with several variants, seems to be saying that the working class, changing at any rate, has been assimilated into the system and is no longer capable of waging a consistent anticapitalist struggle for social change.

The conservative theory fares far worse in explaining contemporary reality. 1968 was a year of widespread and sharp industrial action, ushered in with a postal strike and the protracted and largely successful struggle of metal tradesmen against "absorption" of the margins increase, supported by their "unskilled" and "semi-skilled" fellow workers, who entered the struggle wholeheartedly even though they had little or nothing to gain from it. As the year progressed, industrial action swept across the workforce, involving new workers and raising new possibilities for trade unionism. Journalists, teachers, space technicians and other professional workers came into the fight alongside petrol tanker drivers, railwaymen, aircraft maintenance workers, the postal workers again, not to speak of the constant guerrilla struggles, so usual as not to merit even a press report in most cases, waged in metal factories, the mines and the waterfront.

1969 WILL BE A YEAR OF INDUSTRIAL ACTION, precisely because the class struggle exists objectively, and is sharpening. The
Australian ruling class—the owners and controllers of the economy and their political and industrial auxiliaries—has worked out a coherent and well-planned economic strategy. This aims at nothing less than the introduction of an "incomes policy," not by direct government legislation as in Britain, but by a combination of sheer monopoly economic power, the judicial power of the arbitration system, and the power of the State both to mobilise the national wealth for the monopoly capitalists through taxation and other fiscal powers, and to use legal sanctions against the unions when they use their industrial strength. Essence of a capitalist incomes policy is that it seeks to control wages and salaries, but not profit, interest, rent or prices which are sacrosanct.

Economic power is used through monopoly price-fixing, that does not "fix" prices but continually raises them and so exerts constant pressure upon wage and salary earners and those on fixed incomes (pensioners, etc.). Very little remains of classic bourgeois economic theory, based on "free competition," the market, and "individual private enterprise". However, the right of "private" price fixation is jealously guarded, even when the conditions of price formation through market competition have almost disappeared in the decisive economic sectors. While the monopolies no longer fear but actively demand government economic "regulation" in many fields (including labor), they resist strongly (and successfully) any government regulation of prices or profits.

ARBITRATION'S ROLE IS ENHANCED in the new economic strategy. Over a three year period, the Arbitration Commission has introduced a totally new method of wage-fixing, in which the judicial murder of the basic wage—margins structure was decisive. In its place has emerged the "total wage" and "work-values" structure. This new creation is the employers' brainchild, and its desired future growth into a fullfledged incomes controller is the subject of new demands in the 'Employer's Charter" served on the Commission.

Effects of this new wages structure can be summarised as follows:

• The "total wage", that affects the income of every wage- and salary-earner, will be reviewed annually and varied only according to the Commission's interpretation of economic conditions. This virtually means a general wage-freeze, with any increases barely keeping up with erosion of real wages by price rises. It is an interesting intellectual exercise to consider what economic conditions make a general wage rise
desirable, according to arbitration, government and employers' economic experts. If the economy is booming, any wage rise, they argue, would cause inflation; if there are economic difficulties, a general increase is plainly undesirable, and even dangerous. Add to this the perennial balance of payments problem, which must be met by increasing exports (which means "keeping costs down"—and every bourgeois economist knows that wages are the only costs that can be "kept down") and by dampening demand for imports (and this means the wage-earners' demand above all). There is thus an ironclad case for keeping general wages down; every possible contingency and conjecture of circumstances demands that wages must not rise too much.

- If the general wage is to remain pegged, perhaps there are dramatic new possibilities for increases for specific industries and occupations through "work value" cases? The metal trades case, which provided a $7.40 increase for tradesmen, seemed to promise this. But experience soon showed how thin was this sugar-coating on the bitter pill. Employers, the arbitration machine and governments bitterly resisted any automatic flow-on, and union experience of work-value cases has been salutary—as railway men in general and engine drivers in particular will testify.

In fact, work value cases after the first ones will present many obstacles to establishing a legal argument for new rates. It is necessary to prove new skills and new conditions, and in general technological change makes this harder for most workers in most industries. This is particularly true for those classed by arbitration as semi-skilled and "unskilled". The general trend to establish a low rate for the majority of production workers will be accelerated. In fact, Australia is moving in its own way, towards the conditions of a submerged and depressed class within a class, made up largely of immigrant workers who are the backbone of the production workforce in such basic (and low-paid) industries as steel, automobiles, railways, textile, clothing and food.

THE WORKING CLASS NEEDS A COUNTER-STRATEGY to meet the mounting offensive. The working class is growing, not diminishing, as technological change gathers momentum. Newer elements in the working class, the technicians, planners, teachers and professional workers are no longer a bulwark of conservatism. They increasingly turn to the classical methods of industrial action,
sometimes infusing new methods and concepts into the traditional forms. And industrial workers and their unions have not abdicated the struggle by any means. The changed methods of wage fixing met stern opposition, even if this did not prevent the change. The procedure and final form of the change are instructive, for it was not implemented without problems.

The metal workers, by refusing to accept absorption, struck the first blow, and many thousands of other workers acted or threatened to act to win flow-on against the Court's declared intention. This is the militant alternative to the new system. But it needs to become a powerful movement, uniting blue and white collar unions and all working class political trends in the unions around a common strategy. Unionism often limits its perspectives and usually fights on the terrain dictated by employers and within the employer-oriented "rules" of arbitration. While the employers, governments and arbitration worked purposefully to implement their total wage strategy, the unions have no common counter-strategy that seeks to change the whole terms of the battle. This arises from limitations imposed by influences of conservatism and rightwing reformism in the movement, and failure to understand the implications and possibilities in technological change if a bolder and more fundamental challenge is made to the system itself. And quite frankly the left also has been slow to articulate a strategy for the new conditions. Some lines of thought suggest themselves for consideration.

The new conditions of technological change and higher productivity suggest that unionism should advance more radical demands, both in distribution of the national income and in democratic control of decision-making in workplaces, whole industries and in the places where the public and private bureaucracies decide national policies in secret.

In the field of economic demands, the following are worth considering:

- The union movement should, through intensive research at both academic and grassroot levels, fix upon and substantiate a demand for a minimum living wage. This wage demand (and already-taken surveys and researches suggest it would be at least $60 a week) should then be projected as the alternative to the present "total wage" that is manipulated within the "economic" framework and the irreducible minimum that can placate workers' unrest.

- The demand for equal pay that must bring women's wages up to men's, not scale down somewhere between existing male and female rates.
• The demand for shorter hours, at least the 35 hour claim, and for 4 weeks annual leave.

• The development of industry campaigns (on industry allowances, pensions, etc.) that can embrace all workers, whatever their skill levels, in industries like the automobile, steel and other big and highly monopolised branches of production.

• Develop and sustain industrial campaigning and organisation by unions covering low-paid workers, recognising that these are often mainly immigrant workers with all the attendant special problems.

These and other issues of wages, hours and conditions require a broader horizon and a bolder challenge to the whole system than as yet exists even among most militant unionists. It also requires a new type of unionism, more efficient, more scientific and more highly organised.

There are several trends developing on this plane. The communist view should be based upon a mass-democratic concept of efficient, scientific and highly-organised unionism that is democratic from the workplace upwards to the national level. In this concept, job and workplace organisation is basic, and the real strength of the unions flows from an active membership that can effectively control each union and the state and national centres of the movement.

This stresses the significance of (1) the union delegates, shop committees and industry-wide rank and file organisation embracing direct representatives of all workers whatever their unions; (2) union democracy and active encouragement of activity; (3) union amalgamations; (4) democratic national and state centres that allow for union initiatives and do not seek to impose a control that confines militant unions to the level of the more backward.

This method of union struggle will raise, naturally and logically, issues of democratic control. At its most direct expression, the formation of shop committees and delegates organisation at once asserts the demand for recognition of workers' rights and carries within it the demand for potentially democratic control. At another level, the struggle against arbitration's crippling legalisms, restriction and penalisation of industrial action is a direct, even if only partial, challenge to the capitalist state.

Popular appeal of democratic resistance to arbitration penal powers has been shown again in Western Australia. Seven boilermakers, electing to take jail rather than pay fines for an "illegal" strike, set the Establishment a real problem. United opposition of
unions threatened state-wide industrial action, and support came from varied and sometimes unexpected quarters. Rumor has it that neither would the police have picked them up, nor warders "received" them. Whatever the truth of this story, the fact remains that some anonymous benefactor paid the fines.

TODAY'S ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS affecting wage and salary workers are more directly and obviously political issues. High taxation takes a big bite out of any wage increase, first and most obviously in income tax and then through indirect taxes. Income tax alone has mushroomed—30 years ago a skilled metalworker had to work perhaps two days a year to pay his tax, now he works several weeks.

Ever-increasing government charges—fares, car registrations, hospital fees, TV-radio licences, and an endless list—eat into real wages. Alongside this goes a shameless monopoly price fixing for goods and services, that steadily increases the cost of living, forcing excessive overtime, two jobs or a whole family working to maintain standards. Added to this is the chronic deterioration and rising cost of social services—education, health, local government. It is surely necessary to elaborate a radical working class program of demands and action on all these questions, that monopoly capitalist affluent society projects into the lives of even the most complacent and apathetic citizen. What is needed is an Australian action program, finding in the apparently mundane realities of life the starting point for a radical challenge to existing social relations, morality and political practice. To suggest a few:

- A radically new taxation system, in which the first $2,000 is free, with the wealthy monopolies and individuals paying more.
- Price control that protects the public from monopoly extortion, run by direct popular representatives of unions and consumers.
- A new quality of education for all children, with highly qualified teachers, proper facilities and a modern curriculum.
- A non-contributory health service that provides medical, dental and hospital care for all.
- Increased social services, particularly pensions and child endowment.

These are some of the issues and demands that move masses to concern, yet are in their essence radical and even potentially
revolutionary if asserted by a people's movement as demands upon the powerful groupings that direct and control Australian society.

It would be merely naive to suggest that such a movement can be built easily, or to believe that it only needs a program of demands to come into being. Big problems arise from the character of our society and the power of its dominant ideology, conservatism and capitalist individualism. Other problems arise from the inadequacies of the working class movement and of its left and radical components. The working class movement needs to consider seriously the new left criticisms mentioned above. It is too facile to dismiss them out of hand by pointing to the obvious realities that the mass workers' movement provides the real opposition, the perennial irrepresible counter-action against capitalism, or that the working class must play a decisive role if there is to be a fundamental challenge to the present social system. Even if the new left criticisms were 100 per cent correct (which they are not), the task of the revolutionary vanguard would still have to be assisting the workers to consciousness, to see themselves as a class for itself, otherwise elitism and sectarianism will cut off the vanguard from the masses who alone can make history.

The working class must play a leading role, and for this it needs the co-operation of radical intellectuals and other strata critical of capitalist society. This requires a new approach, eliminating proletarian snobbery and suspicion of intellectuals on one side, elevated condescension and plain lack of knowledge or concern about the actual working class struggle on the other. The left working class movement should understand from its long experience of struggle that the working class has no mystically-endowed right to a leading role. Rather, it has to win this right anew in each new period, by lifting its struggle to new targets, speaking and acting for all whose interests conflict with and whose lives are restricted by capitalist society.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM, and the struggle for a new post-Vietnam foreign policy, is central to this role. The tortuous path to real peace negotiations presents a challenge to all who have opposed the war, for the United States and its Australian and other satellite governments are still pursuing their war aims. Reluctantly, they have recognised that they cannot win the war; further, that they actually faced military defeat in the classical sense of this term.

That is why they finally accepted the offer first made by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in February 1967, after trying
several different military strategies that failed miserably after inflicting immense suffering upon Vietnam and the loss of tens of thousands of American, and hundreds of Australian, lives. If this chance of peace is to be seized, public opinion must demonstrate the demand for immediate withdrawal of US, Australian and satellite troops from Vietnam, recognition of the National Liberation Front and the right of self-determination and independence for South Vietnam.

All the face-saving lies and inspired concoctions about a favorable turn for “The Free World” in the war cannot hide the humiliating defeat of the USA, nor disguise the collapse of the whole Australian foreign policy. But like the Bourbons, the Australian policymakers forget nothing of the canards about defending Australia from Asian Communism and learn nothing from the lesson, magnificently taught by the Vietnamese, that military might cannot today defeat a whole people determined upon national liberation. Forgetting and learning nothing, the policymakers are now working on a “new” policy that prepares for new interventions in Asia to suppress new national liberation movements. This policy calls for mobile strike forces, equipped with modern offensive weapons. Clinging to the FIII is not just political face saving nor inept and precipitous contracting—though both are present. The FIII is the type of “weapons system” required for Asian intervention, even if it is a flop. So the defence review may come up with new plans but they will be directed to the same aims.

Government foreign policy will not change its basic character either; it will still be subject to Washington’s decisions. Johnson is dead; Long live Nixon! And US policy under Nixon will not change its basic character; probably it will only demand a bigger Australian contribution in men and money to further US policies of domination. Australian foreign policy is in a rut from which it can escape only by a complete change enforced by popular action. Unless this can be developed, and soon, Australia will stumble from crisis to crisis, from one Vietnam to a second and a third, sacrificing more and more for policies that end in fiasco and increased dangers.

The struggle for democratic foreign policy is one of the most vital issues for the whole democratic opposition, and the left in particular. It influences every aspect of the struggle against monopoly capitalism, and a real challenge to the economic, political strategy of conservatism is impossible unless there is confrontation on this issue, not the growing trend to bi-partisanship evident in Whitlamite thinking on the “US alliance” as the keystone of Australian foreign policy.
Elliott Johnston
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A member of the commission which drafted the Communist Party's Charter of Democratic Rights gives his views on the issues under debate. This article is based on a contribution made at a recent conference of the Communist Party in South Australia.

THE PUBLICATION of the Communist Party's draft Charter of Democratic Rights has sparked considerable discussion both in the Party and outside it. The Charter is but a first draft. Many valuable suggestions have been made for additions, deletions and clarifications. I stress the importance of such suggestions; but here I want to deal with some broad questions.

What is democracy? It is said that capitalist democracy is freedom for the capitalists to exploit and socialist democracy is democracy for the working masses. Things are more complex than this. "Democracy" as a word is used to describe a particular type of capitalist state; it is also a word which has associations with man's struggle to control his affairs, express his ideas, have equality of opportunity with others, form trade unions, etc. We commonly, and I think correctly, say of some legislation (e.g., much of the legislation introduced by the recent South Australian Labor Government) that it is "democratic", and of other legislation that it is "undemocratic", although neither may touch the foundations of capitalism.

Society, under the impetus of the struggle of oppressed classes and groups, has evolved institutions and rights that are said to be democratic — the right to vote, the right to hold a religious point of view, the right to refute religion, the right of opinion and of publication, of industrial activity, of sex and racial equality. The best of the non-socialists have struggled to defend and advance such concepts of democracy and we owe them a great debt. Socialists take the matter further by declaring that the greatest and fundamental denial of democracy lies in the ownership by one class of the means of production and the exclusion of the exploited classes from the control of such means of production. Class society is incompatible with genuine democracy.
The Charter, in my view, properly and clearly takes up these two aspects of democracy in terms that are Australian. It points up the monopoly domination of the economy, and places the ending of this domination and the creation of social ownership as the central issue, but at the same time it stresses the great importance of democratic institutions and the extension of democratic rights and practices for the struggle of the working class and progressive people under capitalism and for the strengthening and consolidation of socialism.

It is said by some that the Charter raises to a principle the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism. I think that the language of the draft is open to criticism on this point, but I do not think that the Drafting Committee intended to express other than the decision of the last Congress of the Party. The draft does not say and never intended that the struggle for socialism would not be accompanied by violence from the ruling class. Obviously along the way there will be big demonstrations, great strikes, marches, tremendous gatherings and obviously there will be clashes and obviously in some situations reactionary forces will resort to violence. What our Congress said is that in the conditions in Australia and in the world there is the distinct possibility that the transition can be peaceful in that armed uprising against the capitalist state will not be either necessary or desirable.

Years ago the gathering of the 81 Communist and Workers Parties expressed support for this contention.

But some comrades say, or argue as if this is a possibility, but only one possibility, and that the other should be put with equal emphasis. In my view this is wrong. We are for a peaceful transition in the sense I speak of not only because violence is at the best a necessary evil but because the concept of peaceful transition accords with the wishes and aspirations of those who in our country tend towards change, it accords with our own ideas and above everything else because it assists in developing and consolidating as actual forces for social progress those forces in the nation which can potentially bring about fundamental change.

And these forces for change are enormously broad. We do not and never have conceived of the revolutionary struggle as one between just the capitalist class and the industrial working class. The Communist Party's Program has for years placed the monopoly sections of capital as the target of the revolutionary movement in our country and has envisaged almost all other class forces as able to play some positive part (but of course some much more so than others).
The developments of our times extend, not restrict this possibility. Once capitalism was progressive. It had great reserves of strength amongst the people. Small-scale production was prevalent; small capitalists were numerous; the capitalists educated a minority who were close to them; they developed cities, transport, broke down the old restrictions, opened new horizons, capitalism developed the nation and the capitalists appeared as the standard bearers of the nation. Of course this stage of capitalism is long past, but the positions of strength of the capitalist class amongst the people are only slowly eroded.

Today things are different. Increasing monopolisation places power in fewer and fewer hands increasingly remote from the people as a whole. The percentage of employed persons rises, the whole work force requires a higher standard of education, the most educated people are no longer, in the same proportion at least, close to capital; and capital itself is no longer identified with the nation but increasingly with sell out on the one hand or obliteration on the other, of national interest.

Monopoly capital has largely lost and increasingly loses its bases of support amongst the people and is thereby vulnerable at every point. The motor car industry can be exposed for its profiteering at the expense of the consumer, which is the nation; for its exploitation of its own workers; for its domination by foreign capital; and for its pressure to make the private motor vehicle the unit of transport so that much of the argument about transport development, community planning, etc., involves the role of motor vehicle, oil and other monopoly industries.

Every facet of the struggle against monopoly involves questions of democracy. In specifically marxist terms the relations of production are being increasingly socialised, increasing numbers of people of diverse occupations are being drawn into the social process of production but their lives, both as producers and socially, are dominated by fewer monopoly groups. The whole struggle is against the monopolisation of power, for the democratisation of economic and social life.

If we want to help to develop these broad political forces in the struggle against monopoly the Communist Party must speak to them in words which they understand and with policies and perspectives they can approve. It is said that to put the problem this way is to forget about the working class. This is wrong in my view. All the developments I speak of affect the working class itself; expanding it, educating it, changing its productive activity.
This changing working class is now, and will remain this side of socialism, an exploited class, and this aspect of its reality will determine its main social, political and economic activity. But because its way of living and working will be somewhat different, it will approach its problems somewhat differently. Not to see the changes and make our own changes would not be to fight for the working class, but to fail it.

It has been suggested that the concepts of the Draft Charter reject revolution, and if adopted, would obliterate any real difference with the ALP. (This point of view is expressed within the Party and from outside, e.g., by Dr. Charlesworth in *Tribune*). I think this viewpoint is based upon the misconception sometimes expressed in the saying "the ALP believes in evolution, the CP in revolution". The real position is that marxists believe that development takes place both in nature and society by the combination of gradual evolutionary change and rapid revolutionary change, whilst reformism, certainly in practice and mainly in theory too, limits its concept of change to evolutionary change. This is the essence of the difference, not the concept of revolution in the sense of blood and violence. The Charter calls for a decisive and fundamental change in the ownership of the monopolies and thus maintains our independent revolutionary position.

Another great watershed difference with reformism is the communist view that the masses make their own history — reliance on the activity of the masses as against relying mainly or solely on leaders. Here again the Charter makes the position clear. In this context I refer to the criticism that the Charter places undue reliance on parliaments and parliamentary struggle. In my view what the Charter does is to raise to its proper position in the Australian setting the question of our established institutions.

It is crucial that we learn from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries that everything of value from the past must be preserved and built upon. The tradition of elective representative institutions is strong in our land; we must build on our traditions. In Russia the first Duma was won from the Czar in 1905 and in 1917 the institution meant literally nothing to the vast majority; but in England men fought for the principle of the Parliament against despotic power 300 years ago (and particularly the men of the cities — the small producers, the tradesmen, the working class); the Chartist movement fought for the reform of the Parliament and gained to its petition the signatures of more than half the adult population of the country; the diggers at Eureka took up arms for the principle of representative Government; the battlers of the Australian 90's formed the ALP to secure working class
representation in Parliament; perhaps the most widespread and sustained political movement of our Australian history was for Federation, with a corresponding Federal Parliament; the biggest political movement in South Australia since the war has been for electoral reform. Our people accept and will defend Parliamentary representative institutions.

The Parliamentary struggle is not the essence of the struggle — the essence is the activity, striving and effort of the mass of the people — but the essence finds part of its expression in the struggle for election to and for policies to be expressed within the Parliaments; and around the issues in the Parliaments great mass movements are possible.

I turn to one last criticism of the Charter. It is said that the Charter forgets basic marxism in suggesting that in a socialist Australia there should be freedom of speech and association for citizens who hold anti-socialist opinion without breaching the socialist law. I think that on this point we need more thought and fewer slogans. We need to study the writings of great marxists on this point in their historical context. Every State is a dictatorship of a class or classes. A Socialist Australia will be that. But classes exercise their rule in various ways. There is no end to forms, the only principle is that the leading class uses its leading position to consolidate and protect its position. Class rule does not necessarily imply total or even widespread censorship; it does not necessarily imply the suppression of opposition, organisation or representation. We have in Australia the dictatorship of monopoly capital, but that does not mean obliteration of opposition.

The Charter aims at setting down the communists' concept of a socialist Australia. We ought to say boldly and clearly that we are for the right of dissent. Maybe foreign pressures or foreign intervention, or activity against the socialist law from within, will force temporary and partial departures from this principle. If it be so the progressive people will recognise the source and cause of the departure. But for us the guiding principle is the extension and flowering of democracy, both because this agrees with all our aims and because it agrees with the traditions and thinking of the mass of the Australian people without whose active support a socialist Australia is quite impossible.
ITALIAN STUDENTS IN REVOLT

In an article especially written for ALR a prominent Italian communist discusses the reasons for the upsurge of student activism and the attitude adopted towards student radicals by Italian communists.

ITALIAN UNIVERSITIES have been deeply shaken by a great student movement which, through its struggle, reopened discussion not only about the university organisation and structure, but about the whole of the emphasis in study underlying one of the most traditional and conservative institutions of culture and society.

For various reasons the movement attracted immediate attention: its extent — tens of thousands of students from all of Italy's universities (often even from the schools) took part; the length of the struggle—it began in Autumn 1967 and lasted till Summer 1968 and everything seems to point to it beginning again with vigor when the universities re-open; the determination with which the students have fought—violent clashes with the police, dozens of trials, disciplinary measures and intimidation have not stopped the movement; the forms of struggle—occupation of university buildings, study committees on reform, demonstrations on the street, democratic organisation in assemblies; the framework of the struggle—the link established between university questions and the basic and more general problems of Italian society.

Why did this movement occur? What are its specific and more general causes? What does it mean and what does it express? What are its prospects? The crisis in Italian schools is profound and in many ways insoluble within the framework of the present social structure. Here, as in other decisive sectors of Italian society, only great reforms which cut deep into the social fabric are capable of solving the most acute of the problems. (This is true in general of developed capitalist societies.)

There has been a great increase in the school population, especially in middle schools (1956-57, 930,000 pupils; 1961-62, 1,540,000), but also lower middle schools (technical schools, high schools and grammar schools), and in the universities. Faced with this,
about 10 years ago the government took a few routine measures, without even touching on the “social” problem which was implicit in a real democratisation of education. This policy was defeated by a strong movement of opposition in the country, in the schools, and in parliament. And the governments which followed, all led by the Christian Democrats, tried to find a new policy, called a policy of “reform”, essentially designed to make a new instrument of the old school system, one capable of providing, at all levels—from worker to engineer—a workforce suitable for the development of Italian industry. This policy is the one which, in the last few months above all, has experienced complete failure.

In the first place during these years the development has been quite inadequate for the increase in the school population and its growing needs. We lack thousands of classrooms; there are no laboratories; one university professor often teaches a class of 500-600 students and so on. In the second place, the view which regards the school system as an appendix of production again brought to light, and still more clearly, the class character of schooling, both in its selective aspects and in its formative and educative functions. In the third place, contrary to the apologists of neo-capitalism, Italian capitalism, far from developing in an organic fashion, has grown like Topsy, aggravating all the imbalances which are typical of Italian society.

The conjunction of these three elements has accentuated a basic contradiction which accompanies capitalist development and which is tending to become more acute in the conditions of advanced capitalism, making it more obvious and explosive. This contradiction lies on the one hand in the necessity of stimulating the development of education and scientific and technical knowledge, and on the other in the necessity of channelling, controlling and containing this development in a way that meets the demands of the productive system; of maintaining in the schools a selection system related to the class base, which serves to reproduce the social hierarchy and give most of those entering production an inferior education which will prepare them for the subordinate function of manual activity. From this arises the fact that schools are no longer looked on as sectional institutions guaranteeing the fulfilment of tasks, but are rather regarded as one of the aspects of society in which are created the contradictions and contrasts of the whole society itself.

It is in the universities that these contrasts and contradictions show themselves most clearly. The high cost of study and the absence of any right to study show up the system of selection on the basis of class in its clearest form. Only 13.8 per cent of those who are enrolled in the first year of university come from working class families, and only 8.4 per cent of those who finally get
their degrees. But there is also the other class aspect of education—the utilisation of education and cultural and professional training as an instrument of integration into the constituted order, and of absorption into a social hierarchy which is implicitly authoritarian. In relation to this there comes to mind an important observation of Marx (the third Thesis on Feuerbach) in which he maintains that society is divided into two parts, whereby one part is raised above society itself, prosecuting its ideology, its values, its conventions as objective and neutral knowledge, whereby it becomes knowledge serving to predetermine the social destiny to which everyone is assigned.

In the university authoritarianism is expressed at all levels and in every way—from the unquestioned authority of the teachers (baronies, as we call them; "god-professors"), to the system of examinations, to the aristocratic relationship between teacher and student, to the academic hierarchy, to the rigidity of courses. The hierarchic, bureaucratic, sclerotic structure is, in this sense, a response to the institutional functions which are assigned to the university: to educate the cadres of the established order; to deprive the professions, as a distinctive element of the social hierarchy, of every intellectual autonomy. So the university operates more and more within the compass of a wretched and compromised educational system, explicitly excluding all political and social debate, remaining closed to the great problems of our time, an obstacle to any real development of knowledge and the sciences, which find their principal basis in the critical spirit, in non-conformity, in openness to what is new.

Thus the university becomes a catalyst of certain deep contradictions: a) the contradiction between the real democratic spirit of education and the mechanical nature of selection and education by class; and b) the contradiction between the demands of a free, modern, critical culture which allows for the development of the personality and a sclerotic and coercive education. These contradictions clearly express more general ones between the development of the social productive forces and the limits which are placed on them by the actual system of relationships of production and the requirements for maintaining the existing social and political balance. The proof of this is seen in the way in which the powers-that-be reacted to the student movement—just as they do in the bitterest of working class battles. If we add to this the weight that the sciences have assumed in the productive processes and the new relationship which has been established between intellectuals and technicians and capitalist society, we can easily understand the depth of the issues posed by the movement.

The movement began against a government bill which was presented as a "new reform" of the university, and which was in reality no more than a reconfirmation of all the things just
described. Hence the movement launched slogans against authoritarianism in scholarship, demands for an adequate professional training and recognition of the role of professional people. In brief, they made demands not only for a more efficient and better educational system, but for different types of schools and for different societal development. "We don't wish to be robots in the service of the bosses", said one of the leaflets distributed at a student demonstration. Hence the denunciation of the class mechanism in selection and the demand for the right to study for all; hence the demand for and the creation of forms of participatory democracy and student power aimed at the rejection of the view which regards the student as an object in favour of the student as a subject, and a protagonist who is active in university and cultural life. The echo of these demands among the student masses, the degree of mobilisation around them, the result obtained by shaking the old structures and old power relationships indicate how deeply they were felt, creating a situation which became more and more explosive.

On the other hand, the more general relationship established between these specific education problems and the authoritarianism which is implicit in developed capitalist societies, the relationship between the school and production, between liberty and the professions, the stimuli to involve culture (and society) in the great issues and problems of the contemporary world, could not but become involved with the debate on more general political questions, forming a link with vast sectors of public opinion, and being reflected in the whole Italian political situation.

Besides, this connection was, in a certain sense, inevitable. If conditions in the universities were the concrete occasion which precipitated the movement, there were also other causes which generated it, and which can be summed up as the new feeling of responsibility of the intellectual vis-a-vis the revolutionary movement in action throughout the world. Comrade Luigi Longo, general secretary of the Communist Party of Italy, said at a recent meeting of the Central Committee that it appeared to him abstract and incorrect to approach the student movement's problems according to the class origin of its components in the petty, middle and high bourgeoisie, and thus to predict an inevitable petty bourgeois deviation. Comrade Longo said that the element to be stressed was that the movement had exploded in a situation which was decisive for capitalist society, and within the context of a great political and social clash in which the working class and its organisations are ever more the conscious vanguard protagonists.

This must be kept fairly in mind; it would be a mistake to look for the reasons for the movement only in the imbalance between the education system and society, and in the deep crisis which the former is undergoing. Certainly, the acuteness of the problem
of education is something which must not be neglected, but it occurs in a context which is more complex and which concerns the growth of problems of the whole of Italian society, and beyond that of problems which concern the whole world. Thus the influence which the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people has had is incalculable. Around the question of Vietnam has grown up a deep and fiery anti-imperialist feeling, a higher awareness of the value of human beings, of freedom, of national independence and a new feeling of internationalism. All the liberal myths which had been regarded as a pole of attraction for quite a number of youth groups collapsed miserably before the brutality and oppression of Vietnam. This revealed the negative motives implicit in American society which until recently was pointed to as the model to follow. The dramatic problems of that war, as well as the more general problems of the “third world”, intimately connected with the struggle against hunger and underdevelopment, come face to face with the false consumer problems of wealthy civilisation, provoking deep idealistic and moral reactions.

At the same time, the failure of the social-democratic “renewal” (Wilson, Brandt, etc.) caused a further shift. And the whole experience of the Italian centre-left, which failed even to renovate the system internally, the collaboration between catholics and socialists in ever worse forms of power management, all provoked a reaction from the masses of youth who see nothing consoling in this system; even see it as oppressive and degrading; and thus wish to change the system. And it is in this general context that the specific conditions of education have come together to fuse the different elements and transform them into a movement which raises problems of general (revolutionary) renewal of society.

Are there hidden dangers in this movement? No doubt. In it there flourish no small number of extremists, of voluntarists, and much political and ideological confusion. Often there are strategic and tactical evaluations which involve in a passionate polemic the great issues of the working class movement. Typical, for example, is the emergence of a position which underestimates the specific aspects of action in the Italian universities. Behind this underestimation is the belief that the students' struggles are but the occasion for development of a revolutionary vanguard of a new type, in contest with the vanguard organised by the working class. The particular characteristics of Italian society, the presence of a strong Communist Party with a strong working class heritage, the real dialectics, political and social, sometimes escape the student movement, leading it to conduct forays, leading it to assume the role of someone wishing to teach a lesson in revolution to a working class defined as integrated in the system.

Against such positions we must open up a frank political and even polemical debate, and we have done so. But what counts
is to evaluate such dangers soberly, neither exaggerating nor minimising them, and seeing at the same time where they arise from. In an article in *Rinascita* "The Student Movement in the Anti-capitalist Struggle" Luigi Longo, for example, did not hide that there has been a lack of contact between the Party, its activity and attitudes in the universities, and the political and organisational reality which has arisen among the students, especially among the most dynamic and active sectors, that certain political and cultural ferments which existed in the universities interested our members and organisations only belatedly. Hence a certain lag which was a lag in ideas and politics, not only in understanding what was happening, but which also led to avoiding contact, in turn assisting the emergence of attitudes which we consider extremist or mistaken.

How then can we move towards the student movement? We intend to do so by respecting its autonomy of action and initiative, and by considering it as a rich and positive movement from which the whole of Italian society and politics can derive important benefits. A relationship with the movement, therefore, which is open but which seeks unity. To be present in the reality of the movement, Longo wrote in the article cited, means not only to note what happens, but to intervene continuously through debate and action, to clarify situations, to overcome doubts, to reject errors.

It is not a question of making references to theses and prefabricated schemes, but, without any belief in superiority and infallibility, of replying to attitudes with our own attitudes, replying to opinions with our own opinions in a concrete fashion, striving each time to understand the origins, the significance, the range, even of what seems at first sight to be absurd or distorted. What is more, this is the way to keep with the issues, to measure our reasoning against the reasoning of others, assimilating what we find good and of value in their ideas.

We maintain that the student movement cannot and should not counterpose itself to the political organisations of the working class, to its party, and in this specific case to the Communist Party. It is by working in this spirit that we believe the problem of the incorporation of the student movement in the strategy of the working class struggle in Italy can be positively solved. It is with this method that we are convinced of the role the student forces of Italy play, and of the need to call to the attention of all Italian society, and particularly of the workers' movement, issues, problems and demands to which must be found a complete and valid reply, so that revolutionary strategy may be capable of carrying out the tasks it has set itself in a country of developed capitalism.
DISCUSSION:

The Principle of self-determination

SELF-DETERMINATION QUALIFIED

"THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT cannot triumph within the old framework of the fatherland. It creates new, superior forms of human society, in which the legitimate requirements and progressive aspirations of the working masses of every nationality will for the first time be satisfied in international unity on the basis of the abolition of existing national barriers". (my emphasis—JBH). Lenin "The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International."

In his article "On Self-Determination", (Australian Left Review No 5 1968) Ted Bacon, in the second paragraph states: "No justification of the occupation of socialist Czechoslovakia by the armed forces of the USSR and four other socialist states has yet been attempted in terms acceptable to marxists. The right of all nations to self-determination has been an established marxist principle for many years."

However, in the same paragraph, he admits that should the circumstances be grave enough "demonstrably very grave indeed", then this "occupation" (Ted Bacon's word) would be "permissible".

It is clear therefore that he agrees that in certain circumstances a higher principle applies. Nevertheless the tenor of his article appears weighted against this view and he speaks of "striking right at the heart of a major principle of socialism — the right of all nations to self-determination".

That the situation was sufficiently grave to warrant the application of this greater and higher principle is precisely the case of the USSR and the four other socialist states.

This being so it is strange indeed that nowhere in his article does he attempt to disprove the case of the five socialist states.

The evasion of the case of the Five has been a marked and disturbing feature of those in Australia who disagree with the action of the Five.

They just know the situation wasn't grave. This, despite the fact that for months past the USSR and others in numerous documents have pointed to the growing danger of German revanchism and the huge build up of armaments.

Ted Bacon says: "Imminent danger of imperialist intervention and internal counter-revolution can be discounted". That's that!

His admission that in certain circumstances a higher principle than self-determination should prevail makes the remainder of his article largely pointless if he does not disprove the case of the Five with respect to the necessity for the application of the higher principle.
In discussions in Brisbane some Communists held that self-determination was an immutable principle applicable in all circumstances even to the extent of agreeing to Czechoslovakia going back to capitalism if that was what the people wanted. One must assume that no Warsaw Pact assistance should be forthcoming to assist those inside Czechoslovakia fighting against this.

In this connection Lenin once said: "But no Marxist, without flying in the face of Marxism and socialism generally, can deny that the interests of socialism are higher than the interests of the right of nations to self-determination". (Theses by Lenin on the Question of a Separate and Annexationist Peace).

What relevance can Ted Bacon’s examples about oppressor nations and oppressed nations have with regard to the Czechoslovak crisis?

He says: “The early Soviet Governments, for example, did not intervene to enforce socialism in such former parts of the Russian Empire as Finland and Poland”.

This is supposed to show that the situation then was such as to be even graver than that in Czechoslovakia today, yet as a matter of principle the Soviet Government did not intervene “to enforce socialism”.

Is Ted Bacon here admitting that the action of the five Warsaw countries was to enforce socialism in Czechoslovakia? If so, my case is proved. Enforcing it against reaction!

However, let us look at the facts re Poland and Finland at that time.

In 1917 Finland declared its independence from Russia. Even though it was a bourgeois government in Finland the Soviet Government promptly agreed. This is in accordance with self-determination of nations at such a period in history.

Also in accordance with marxist theory, the Social Democrats and workers of Finland were urged by Lenin to fight against their own government for the socialist revolution in Finland, to link a socialist Finland with the rest of the Soviet Union.

In January 1918 the Red Guards of Finland commenced a struggle for socialism which was drowned in blood.

This was at the time of Brest-Litovsk negotiations and to suggest that the Soviet Union was in a position to assist in Finland, Poland or anywhere else was ridiculed by Lenin. This is surely well known.

It is apparently forgotten that Poland and Finland were part of the sacrifice that had to be made at Brest-Litovsk to preserve the Socialist Republic.

Lenin specifically states that assistance to such revolutions was “an aim clearly defined and approved by the Socialist Army”… “However, we obviously cannot set ourselves this aim at the given moment” (Lenin’s emphasis). (Theses by Lenin on the Question of the Immediate Conclusion of a Separate and Annexationist Peace).

If Ted Bacon’s example has any relevance whatsoever for Czechoslovakia it is to show that today the USSR and the four others are in a position to defend and safeguard socialism in that country and elsewhere.

With regard to the mistakes of Stalin and the CPSU on the National Question which is mentioned (and no doubt some mistakes were made) I will let Ted Bacon answer himself: “Though the Soviet Union is rightly regarded as a model of a multi-national state, it is not a perfect model”. (emphasis mine JBH).

He quite correctly maintains that the denigrations of Stalin, Khrushchov and others were never satisfactory ex-
planations for marxists. I will not deny that this may possibly have some relevance to Czechoslovakia.

One must agree that on the evidence available limitations on freedom of expression and other errors are present in the Soviet Union but here too let us have no blanket denunciations.

After all is it not the same USSR that is providing such life-saving assistance to socialism in Vietnam; that is an indispensable bulwark for the development of the national liberation movements throughout the world?

The colossal assistance of all kinds given by the USSR to socialist countries and progressive movements, especially in developing countries, on the initiative of the CPSU is of the same nature and stems from the same source as the action of the USSR in Czechoslovakia.

Despite great expansion of democracy in the USSR (see P. Clancy's article "Discussion" No. 1 1968), weaknesses still exist.

However, to assume that from these weaknesses stems a violation of "established marxist principles" in Czechoslovakia is no more justified than to assume that the tremendously progressive role in other areas stems from these same weaknesses.

The so-called violation of marxist principles never took place. The action in Czechoslovakia resulted, not because of the weaknesses in Soviet democracy but for another reason altogether — the threat to socialism in that country. For reasons of the highest marxist principle!

Ted Bacon says that: "The main crime of the Czechoslovak Party has, in the eyes of Soviet leaders, been their determination to take the bold step of abolishing the restrictions on democracy which has caused alarming slowdown of progress and widespread discontent among the Czech and Slovak peoples and in their Party".

Why would the Soviet want to prevent the raising of the rate of progress in Czechoslovakia?

The oft stated case is (and I repeat it once again from the latest Moscow News to hand, No. 40) "The danger presented by the internal and foreign reaction, which was preparing a counter-revolutionary coup in Czechoslovakia with the idea of wresting the country from the camp of socialism".

Ted Bacon and others can refuse to accept this if they so desire, but in so doing they are not rebutting the Soviet case but one of their own choosing.

The Warsaw five agreed in their first letter to Czechoslovakia in July that there were forces in that country — listed them — capable of handling the dangerous situation, but the necessary lead was not being given.

It was when the danger had become "demonstrably very grave indeed" that they acted to defend socialism in Czechoslovakia and thus in the Socialist Commonwealth of which Czechoslovakia is an integral part.

The socialist world has entered the epoch of the transition to Communism. The Warsaw Pact countries, including Czechoslovakia (though not all as yet at the same level of development) will attain to Communism in the same historical epoch.

They are leaving behind the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat though not entirely as yet.

Old formulas regarding self-determination no longer have full application. This is the period to ever greater integration, not drawing away.

The ever closer integration of the socialist countries economically, cul-
turally and in defence will lead to the abolition of national boundaries. This, of course, will be a process of development over a period.

National differences will persist for a lengthy period but defence of the system to allow of this development is an immediate matter.

This drawing together of nations has been the over-riding principle in the right of nations to self-determination since Marx.

No Communist would advocate the withdrawal of a socialist country from the Socialist Commonwealth. No Communist would permit the forcible removal of a socialist country from that Socialist Commonwealth.

The Soviet Union and the other four socialist countries have acted in accordance with the "established marxist principle" of self-determination since Marx.

J. B. Henderson

EQUALITY — NATIONS AND PARTIES

IT IS NOW widely accepted that the occupation of Czechoslovakia, which was a heavy blow to socialist influence in the world, violated the established principles of relations between socialist nations and between Communist Parties. Ted Bacon's article on Self Determination dealt with the marxist-leninist principle of relations between socialist nations and only briefly touched upon the principles governing relations between communist parties. The 1957 and 1960 meetings of the world communist movement, taking into account violations of the rights of parties during the Stalin period, spelt these out. The 81 Parties meeting declared unequivocally:

"All the marxist-leninist parties are independent and have equal rights; they shape their policies according to the specific conditions in their respective countries and in keeping with marxist-leninist principles, and support each other."

In order to overcome the serious political and economic weaknesses inherited from the Novotny regime, the Dubcek leadership set out to renovate the economy. They also introduced simple and direct democratic measures and took steps designed to give to "socialism the human face appropriate to it," to use the significant and expressive phrase of Mr. Dubcek. The efforts of the new government were in sharp contrast to the bureaucratic and repressive methods of the Novotny Government and quickly won strong support among the people.

The CPSU and the parties from other socialist countries showed growing concern at the democratic methods and development in Czechoslovakia. There is no doubt that these democratic methods and measures went beyond the democratic practice in other socialist countries, especially in the field of freedom of the press and ideas, and abolition of censorship. There is also no doubt that those measures were taken advantage of by anti-socialist forces, who became more active. The Czechoslovak Communist Party was well aware of this, as a perusal of their documents will show. They were proceeding systematically within the law and the agreed democratic procedure — there could be no return to the repressions and violations of law that took place during the Novotny regime — to deal with anti-socialist activity.

The Czechoslovaks maintained that in their conditions and with their traditions democratic freedoms should be extended and democratic processes should permeate the whole of the organisational structure and methods of party and government leadership; but their far-reaching proposals were not acceptable to the other Parties.
The statements and activities of anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia were seized upon by the press in some of the other socialist countries and magnified out of all proportion to the reality and increasing pressure was exerted on the Czechoslovak Party to modify its democratic program.

Explaining the reasons for the military occupation of Czechoslovakia Pravda, August 28, wrote that it was necessary because of "the threat to the socialist system and the constitutionally established statehood in Czechoslovakia from counter-revolutionary forces that have entered into compact with external forces inimical to socialism."

As socialists we are not indifferent to the fate of socialism in Czechoslovakia or any other socialist state. No socialist would stand by and watch Czechoslovakia torn from socialism by internal and external counter-revolutionaries. The community of socialist nations have a common defence organisation, the Warsaw Pact, and it is accepted by them that a threat to one would be a threat to all of the socialist countries. The Czechoslovak Government and Party in statement and practice reaffirmed their support for the Warsaw Pact.

The question arises, was there a serious threat of counter-revolution in Czechoslovakia? The party with the fullest and most precise knowledge of the class forces and the political situation in Czechoslovakia is the Czechoslovak Communist Party. It is an outstanding party with a most capable and responsible leadership. It had a long experience of struggle against capitalism, it led the fight for the socialist revolution in Czechoslovakia to victory and for 20 years has led the nation in the building of socialism.

The Czechoslovak Party rejected the view advanced by the CPSU and the other Parties that there was a serious danger of counter-revolution. They explained the measures they had already taken and new steps they were about to take to combat the anti-socialist forces and activities. They stressed the importance they attached to their democratic Action Program for socialist renewal in Czechoslovakia. They pointed out that apart from the strong growth of mass support for the party and government resulting from the democratic measures they had implemented, they also had powerful forces in the shape of the military, workers' militia and police, that could effectively deal with any counter-revolutionary actions should these occur.

As we now know, the CPSU and the other Parties chose to reject this estimation of the Czechoslovak Party. They proclaimed instead their own estimation of the situation — that a serious threat of counter revolution existed, and despatched military forces to occupy the country. When this was completed they then dictated changes in the policy of the Czechoslovak Party, including modifications of its democratic program.

The military occupation of Czechoslovakia was in direct conflict with the "principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty and non intervention in each other's internal affairs" which the CPSU declared in 1956 and reaffirmed as late as the Bratislava Agreement in 1968, as the foundation for the relations between socialist states. It was also in violation of decisions of the world communist movement on the relations between parties, on the independence and equal rights of parties.

The events in Czechoslovakia pose the most serious questions for the world communist movement. The idea that one party or several parties acting in concert can place themselves above other parties, is wrong and very dan-
gerous for the world communist movement.

The principle that each communist party is independent and has equal rights, that each Communist Party basing itself on marxism-leninism decides policy in its own country is crucial for the future of the communist parties and the world communist movement.

B.J.

A MAJOR PRINCIPLE

TED BACON and ERIC AARONS have made useful contributions (ALR No. 5, 1968) in helping to establish the lines of self-investigation forced on the socialist movement by the surprise invasion of socialist Czechoslovakia by five of her fellow socialist countries and Warsaw Pact allies, headed by the Soviet Union.

Nothing—not even the great schism with China—has created such profound problems for the world communist movement in recent years as this act (which was an uninvited invasion, no matter how unpalatable the word may be) and the methodical interference in Czechoslovak affairs which has followed, even if some can find consolation in the fact that this interference has the justification of “agreements” made under duress.

Hungary in 1956 could be explained in terms of the actions of counter-revolutionaries there, though the explanation failed to satisfy many and more may yet be heard about that operation. China was a body blow, but marxists could and still can reason that the madness of the Mao cult must pass with the growing-up of Chinese socialism, as did the Stalin cult in the USSR. Whatever validity Chinese criticisms of the CPSU may have had was destroyed by the inharmonious, unsubstantial nature of the Chinese argument and the systematic divergence of Chinese theory and prac-tice from marxism. But Czechoslovakia is a very different matter. Her right to self-determination has clearly been violated and, as Ted Bacon points out, this could be justified only if it were proved beyond doubt that no other course was open.

To lay the chief stress—as some do—on the fact that the right to self-determination is only one of the principles of socialist democracy, which may be overridden by greater considerations, is wrong.

Self-determination is one of the main principles, not something of relative unimportance. Lenin regarded it as the principle of democracy in relation to the national question, an essential part of the democracy he considered the key question in the struggle for socialism.

Nationalism, for good or for evil, is very much a part of the world we live in—a world still divided into hundreds of nationalities. It is the aim of socialism to break down national antagonisms, to work consistently to build international friendship and understanding. Socialism envisages a world in which all distinctions based on national, religious, class and other such differences will be eliminated: the “amalgam” of nations of which the earlier socialists spoke often. But all experience shows that the breaking down of the mutual hatreds, suspicions, jealousies, etc., formed during the centuries of national conflicts and oppressions is a slow and painstaking process, in which all socialists—and especially those representing great and powerful countries—have to exercise the greatest tact and patience in their relations with those of other countries, especially those which (like the Czechs and Slovaks) have experienced generations of oppression and disregard or contempt of their national characteristics.

This was always Lenin’s starting point in his arguments with the “lefts”
such as Rosa Luxembourg about the right of, e.g., Poland, Finland, even the Ukraine, Byelorussia and other subject nationalities to secede from Russia— an argument he developed long before the matter became one of practical politics for the Bolsheviks after the 1917 Revolution. At all times, he treated the right to self-determination as the principal aspect of the question, though conceding that occasions might arise when it would have to be treated as secondary.

Stalin, in theory at least, supported Lenin’s view, The right of Union Republics freely to secede from the USSR, as well as other sovereign rights, is still contained in the Soviet Constitution. In fact, all Soviet theoreticians have treated the right to self-determination as an essential part of socialist internationalism. In one of the most important Soviet works on international law to appear recently (Peaceful Coexistence, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968) the distinguished lawyer Georgi Zadorozhny, Professor of International Law at the Soviet Institute of Foreign Relations, writes (p. 305): “The principle of self-determination . . . has acquired cardinal importance in the present era of transition from capitalism to socialism. . . Self-determination implies the inalienable right of every nation to a free choice of political, economic, social and cultural system, form of government and state structure; it means that no state may impose any system or form of government on any other nation, and affirms the right of every people to develop the political, economic and social order it has chosen.”

We have, of course, been given a great many assurances by Soviet and other writers that the situation in Czechoslovakia was very grave. But the Czechoslovak leaders—highly experienced and popular Communists—have steadfastly denied this and true friends of the Soviet Union could only wish that most of the Soviet explanations (including the booklet On Events in Czechoslovakia by a group of Soviet journalists) had never been printed. Instead of the cast-iron proof that is needed, what we have been given is a series of different reasons for the invasion, flagrant misrepresentations of many occurrences and writings in Czechoslovakia, and some (probably accurate) accounts of the plans and dreams of counter-revolutionaries inside and outside Czechoslovakia and of West German revanchists, CIA agents and others.

Even if all the voluminous quotations could be taken at their face value, there is no semblance of proof that counter-revolution was getting on top, that imperialist invasion was imminent or that the Czechoslovak Party, Government and armed forces were unable to cope with the situation.

Above all, it is impossible to explain away the fact that the Czechoslovak Party and Government said clearly and firmly, while they could still speak freely, that the invasion was uninvited and unwarranted.

The argument put forward by some (including, according to reports, Brezhnev at the Polish Party Congress this month) that once a country has become socialist there can be no turning back, is dubious marxism. Certainly, all marxists will agree that, after establishing socialism every nation needs to exercise great vigilance and firmness—including force, if necessary—to prevent the overthrown oppressing class from making a comeback. But this is a vastly different thing from the use of external force to prevent a nation from changing direction. The role of force as a positive part of the building of socialism is limited in time and extent and is secondary to the develop-
REVISIONISM

THE ROLE OF CHIEF spokesman of right-opportunism and revisionism in the C.P.A. is being played by Eric Aarons, and his outstanding effort to date is his article Censorship and Socialism (A.L.R. No.5, 1968). Aarons' modus operandi is faithfully adhered to in this article. Under cover of a pretentiously serious and profound analysis of problems and events, Aarons proceeds to slander the Soviet Union and distort the principles of marxism-leninism.

Communists are orientated on the position of irreconcilable struggle against imperialism — the ferocious enemy of human progress. "Concrete analysis of a concrete situation", the chief requirement of materialist dialectics, demands, today, that the examination of any problem of socialist activity must proceed from the need for unity in the struggle against imperialism's global attempt to halt human progress. Close analysis of Aarons' article, purporting to be a principled study of censorship and socialism, reveals no recognition, let alone explicit mention, that our enemy is imperialism whose aim, in which ideological weapons play an important part, is to destroy all the gains of the international working class and national-liberation movements. Reading Aarons, one would imagine our main enemy is the U.S.S.R. Censorship, he declares, is wrong in itself. The class struggle can be forgotten. What communists need, especially in the socialist countries, is practice (like a boxer in training!) in combating hostile ideas and, in order to have maximum practice there must be the maximum publication of anti-socialist ideas. We can ignore the 1960, 81-Parties Statement which said:— "Historical experience shows that the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people persist over a long period even after the establishment of a socialist system. This demands extensive work by the party for the communist education of the people and a better marxist-leninist training of party and government cadres". "The task", the Statement said, "is to work to free the people from the shackles of all types and forms of bourgeois ideology, including the pernicious influence of reformism, and to disseminate among the people progressive ideas making for social advancement, the ideas of democracy and freedom, the ideology of scientific socialism."

This work is unnecessary, says Aarons, in effect. Let there be no censorship of hostile ideas. Let the ideologues of imperialism disorientate the masses with demagogy, slander, and lies; let them confuse the people with cunning appeals to nationalism, racism, religion. How can the astronomers prove the earth is round if the flat earth theorists are not able to provide the necessary competition? According to Aarons' revisionism, the principles of "freedom" of expression and discussion stand above the interests of the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of the working people. As long as we can beat the
imperialists in open debate they will retire from the scene. The suppres-
sion, in a working-class state, of re-
actionary, anti-socialist propaganda is,
in Aarons' view, "censorship" which he declares to be impermissible. Such is the "utter disastrousness of oppor-
tunism which . . . helplessly surren-
derers to the bourgeois psychology, uncrit-
ically adopts the point of view of bour-
geois democracy, and blunts the weapon of the class struggle of the
proletariat." (Lenin: *One Step For-
ward, Two Steps Back*, 1904). One of
Lenin's oft-quoted statements is: "In its struggle for power the proletariat
has no other weapon but organisa-
tion." Aarons has revised this. His ver-
sion of the struggle is this: Proletarian
organisation is unnecessary. Give the
workers ring-side seats to the great polemical fight in which the "marx-
ists" (read — "intellectual anarchists")
take on all-comers and annihilate
them!

Aarons makes the brilliant discovery
that "the view that ideas alone can
cause a counter-revolution is in con-
tradiction with the marxist concept of
the relation between life and
ideas". He does not say who has ex-
pressed this view, but, by implica-
tion, he attributes it to the leaders
of the C.P.S.U. This, of course, is quite
dishonest because no-one in the
C.P.S.U. has advanced such a view.
The Czechoslovakian counter-revolu-
tionaries had more than "ideas", un-
less in the category of "ideas" we can
include the 13 machine-guns, 81 tom-
my-guns and 150 cases of ammunition
found in the Prague House of Jour-
nalists, or the statement by the fascist
Brodsky at a gathering of members
of the Prague "Club-231" that "The
best communist is a dead communist,
and if he is alive, his legs should be
torn off!" Who, then, is guilty of a
"contradiction with the marxist con-
cept of the relation between life and
ideas"? It is not the unknown pro-
tagonist of the non-existent view that
"ideas alone can cause a counter-
revolution"; it is the known person
who signs his name to the opportunist
prattle that ideas alone can win and
defend a revolution!

Every communist reader of the
*A.L.R.* should carefully analyse this
article by Eric Aarons, every para-
graph of which reeks with right-
opportunism and revisionism.

E. Aarons is not among those who
express failure to understand the resolute measures taken by the allied
socialist countries in Czechoslovakia.
He understands everything. There
was, Aarons declares, no counter-
revolution, no imperialist subversion,
no direct interference by the C.I.A.
and the agencies of West Germany,
not even an ideological offensive by
capitalism; the Communist Party of
Czechoslovakia had everything under
control because it had won everybody's
heart by abolishing censorship and
bringing the joys of bourgeois "free-
dom of the press" to Czechoslovakia.

It was all a "monumental blunder"
by the U.S.S.R., Aarons informs us.
Fifty years of Soviet power and soci-
alist economic, social and cultural
achievements, fifty years of unrelet-
ting front-rank fighting against imper-
ialism have produced nothing more
than a monumental blunder, plus a
stringful of puppets in the other social-
ist countries who can be dragged into
participating in this blunder. There
are no socialist gains of the interna-
tional working class and the commu-
nist movement. At least nothing to
get enthusiastic over. There are only
"sham ideological struggle", "com-
munist-official lies", "persecution of
writers", "bureaucracy", "censorship",
"repression", "erroneous and contrived
theories", "dubious interpretations of
marxism-leninism", "mismangement",
"lack of freedom", "reliance on posi-
tions of authority", "concentration of
power", "flabby ideological atmo-
spheres (?)", "repetition of so-called
well-known truths about the glorious this and the unshakeable that", "boring formalism", "self-deception" and so on, without end. And this is not anti-Sovietism! This is "principled criticism"!

ANALYST

1948-1968

IF HISTORY does not repeat itself exactly, it does offer such similarities as to make one pause and wonder. Twenty years ago in January 1948 a keynote speech was made in Yugoslavia by President Tito who said in part "... democracy of a new type is possible and can be obtained'.

At the end of March that year the Communist Party of the Soviet Union complained to the then Communist Information Bureau of certain trends in Yugoslavia. They did not complain directly to Yugoslavia but commentators in Pravda and other journals were making their points clear enough for all who wanted to read.

The Communist Parties of Eastern Europe soon supported the accusations of the USSR, again without seeking to know Yugoslavia’s side to the story. Then came an exchange of letters, a summons to a meeting which Yugoslavia refused to attend on the grounds that the majority had already made up their minds, and then, at the end of May, Yugoslavia was expelled from the Cominform and dramatic calls were made to Yugoslav communists to correct the course of their leaders or to remove them.

The analogy with Czechoslovakia in 1968 is fair enough even if events moved faster — from January till May and not from January till August — but not so far.

In 1948 Yugoslavia was merely excommunicated, not invaded. The analogy holds further when one considers the nature of the accusations. Reading the booklet On Events in Czechoslovakia it is an interesting exercise to compare the charges made with those of the Cominform in 1948. Yugoslav leaders were accused of paying lip service to the USSR but secretly slandering it, slandering the Soviet army by claiming that officers were there without invitation and were, therefore, qualifying Yugoslav independence, stifling democracy in the Yugoslav Party by expelling those communists who wanted to be friends with the USSR, submerging the party, seeking imperialist credits, identifying the external policies of the USSR and the USA, denying the leading role of the working class. Need one continue?

The proofs of these charges were similar to the current proofs. An unnamed leader of the Yugoslav CP is quoted as speaking of "degeneration" in the USSR. This was said to be "borrowed from the arsenal of the counter-revolutionary Trotsky". Anna Pauker quoted another unidentified Yugoslav leader as saying that Yugoslav communists should not study the Short History of the CPSU (B) as a main text since this could lead to ‘mechanical’ transference of experiences. She saw this as clear proof of revising theories on the role of the Communist Party and called the Short History the "clearest, most profound, militant account". In July 1948 proof of the Yugoslavs’ intransigence was seen in the size of their CP. It was one of the smallest in the socialist world, only Albania’s was smaller. Yet within a few months in the trials of Eastern Europe the excuse or proof that the CP’s of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, etc., were infiltrated with enemy agents was that they were too big!

In case there are those, who, like the Chinese, doubt Yugoslavia’s claim to be a socialist country one must turn to 1955. At this time the CPSU
stated, "We sincerely regret what took place and decisively thrust aside all that attended that period . . . (we have) studied materials, grave accusations and insults lodged against Yugoslavia . . . the facts show that these materials were fabricated by the enemies of the people, despicable agents of imperialism, who deceitfully wormed their way into the ranks of our party" (the CPSU–M.R.).

For those who say that the USSR is always right one may ask was it right in 1948 and wrong in 1955 or vice versa?

Perhaps the most pertinent comment of 1955 was contained in the official speech of the Soviet Government, delivered by then Premier Khrushchov, at Belgrade Airport. Speaking on behalf of one socialist country to another he said.

"Following the teachings of the founder of the Soviet State, V. I. Lenin, the Government of the Soviet Union builds its relations with other countries — big and small — upon the principles of peaceful co-existence of states, upon the principles of equality, non-interference and respect for sovereignty and national independence, upon the principle of non-aggression and recognition of the inadmissability of some states encroaching upon the territorial integrity of others."

Was the Soviet Union right in 1955 and wrong in 1968 or vice versa?

Little wonder that it is the Yugoslav communist leader Edward Kardelj who has written so thoughtfully on the topic of socialism and war. His book written originally in reply to Chinese attitudes has a pertinent message in today’s situation. Here there is room for only one point: “Both the Russian and the Yugoslavian revolutions took place in countries which were relatively backward economically, in countries of reactionary dictatorships, where every appearance of democratic ideas had been stifled. The automatic transfer of the experience and forms of those revolutions — even were we to presume them to be without faults, which is not the case — to any more developed country with a relatively firmly established democratic tradition, might result in a complete isolation of the revolutionary forces from the people.

“In brief, socialism is not spread by simple repetition or extension of forms already achieved, but by the constant birth and perfection of new forms, which influence the old ones, enriching them and in this way stimulating them to the further advancement of socialism. Anything that hinders this process, anything which is thrown into the process as an alien body — here meaning above all any form of political or ideological monopoly or domination — constitutes a brake, a temporary disturbance, the reflection of difficulties and deformations in overcoming of the contradictions of the internal movements of socialist society, and for this reason needs to be submitted to the criticism of practice, which is possible only under conditions of the free development of the socialist relationships in every country separately.

“And here is why we Yugoslavs, in the name of socialism and as revolutionaries, are against the imposing of socialism or any particular socialist forms either by war or by any form of force or pressure from without.” Such a book is worthy of reading or re-reading.

It is simply my assessment that as with Yugoslavia the Soviet Union will have to make a re-appraisal of the events of Czechoslovakia. Let us hope it does not take until 1975. It is simply my speculation that in the short run the policies of Khrushchov, good (of which there were many) along with the bad are all...
in danger of repudiation. This would square the circle and make 1948 right, 1955 wrong and 1968 right but then who wants a squared circle, especially one that, to come out right, would require the rehabilitation of a Stalin and a Beria and a renewal of the guilt of countless innocents?

Czechoslovakia, like Yugoslavia, is not just raising ‘national independence’ to the nth degree but the very nature of socialism.

Mavis Robertson

2 Anna Pauker, Rumanian communist leader, later removed from positions of authority because of her connections with Stalinist persecutions.

BASIC CAUSES

Ted Bacon, in his article “On Self-determination” (ALR No. 5) repeated the still neglected questions asked by Togliatti in his last letter, printed both in Italy and Moscow Pravda more than ten years ago: Why have such bad tendencies persisted with the good ones within socialist society in the USSR? He asked again in the words of Togliatti: “... the problem of the origin of the Stalin personality cult has not been solved up till now and ... no explanation has been furnished as to how it became possible at all.”

“Denigration of Stalin, Beria, Molotov or Khrushchov were never satisfactory ‘explanations’ for marxists,” Bacon points out “but most believed or hoped that the mistakes of the past would never recur, that their causes had been or were being eliminated.” This persistence of what may be termed “Stalinism” led to the failure to appreciate and then respect the rights of the Czechs and led to a recurrence of what has been termed “Great Russian chauvinism” in relation to smaller nations.

A pattern that became as firmly woven into the processes of Soviet life as the Stalin “impatience” and “lack of respect for the individual” will not disappear automatically with Stalin’s death, nor by trying to wish away the facts and consequences. One of the real values of Bacon’s article is its call for marxists to get to the root causes of past wrongs and begin to provide real remedies, instead of trying to ignore and forget the past. It is not surprising that doubts arise about all aspects of the Czechoslovaks’ problems within Australian unions, but it is surprising that the special viewpoints of the Czech unions firmly backed by leaders of the World Federation of Trade Unions don’t attract more interest and response from Australian unionists.

The needs of socialist man in Czechoslovakia today and the promise of the future arising from a new technological base and really humane industrial relationships, in which man has truly mastered technology, is a peculiarly trade-union concept discussed for some years, now, by Czech workers, their unions and the leading union journal Czech Trade Unions. This debate and the understanding achieved by Czech unions and unionists appears to have had no parallel in any other socialist or capitalist country.

Whilst the confusion among the “Left” in the Australian unions is understandable, there’s no simple set of words that can rectify it. It is of little use pointing to the “political narrowness” of Australian unions, to their containment by the Commonwealth Bureaucracy through adher-
ence to the compulsory arbitration system and absolute regulation and authoritarian control of every phase of union activity. It is of little use merely pointing to the way in which "Left" union ideas, resolutions, decisions and programs have been channelled into the Albert Monkian consensus and containment. For "Left" unionists in Australia to understand why and how the Czech unions have been struggling, it becomes necessary to move to an understanding of the way in which Australian unions, left, right and centre, have allowed themselves to become so integrated with the needs of Australia's national and international monopolies and made so completely another arm of the bureaucracy — this powerful, all pervasive Commonwealth Bureaucracy.

To achieve that necessary understanding of the Czech struggle, Australian unions on the "Left" need to come to an understanding of the "democratic and personal freedoms" they need and must fight for if they too are to meet the challenges of the scientific and technological revolution successfully. These are the similar "democratic and personal freedoms" Togliatti condemned Stalin and the CPSU for destroying and not renovating and restoring after Stalin's death. And it is of no use "Left" unionists backing away from this frank examination of errors and deformations in Soviet society (as well as its great achievements at the same time.)

The revolutionary conformism of other Parties with the post-Lenin CPSU and the kind of special legitimacy which that Party conferred on other Parties and Marxists is now ending. First it was Yugoslavia developed a kind of illegitimacy, then China and Albania, then Cuba and then Romania, but now Czechoslovakia. The same illegitimacy of Parties in former capitalist and present capitalist countries can be traced from Poland to Japan, but this now begins to develop, it seems, in Italy, France, Britain, Australia and Japan... everywhere!

The heirs of Stalin's legitimacy are now denying it for whatever it has been worth!

Is the CPSU to take over even more of the infallibility being shed by the Popes? Or are the USSR and the CPSU to take their rightful places as the first and leading socialist state which has, because of peculiar difficulties, had certain kinds of failures which its heirs have been reluctant to examine fully?

Some of the broadsheets with extracts from Gus Hall, CP USA, now being circulated to unions give a small part of what American Marxists are saying. One Party newspaper has already moved right away from the stand taken by Gus Hall, and his stand has little support among US unions, intellectuals and students.

But as important as those questions may be, the Czechs have projected every socialist's views into the future — what measures and forms of democracy and freedom must people have to secure some of the promise of the scientific and technological revolution in capitalist countries and all of that promise in socialist countries. Without projecting it too far, those questions carefully pursued should bring us nearer to an understanding of the "heresies" of China and Cuba — is it possible to make the new socialist man before or partly before building the material basis of that new socialist man?

Freeing the critical ability and intelligence of Australians — unionists, Marxists, intellectuals — from socialist conformity and the "socialist consensus" is as necessary as freeing them from the imperialist consensus. The struggle by the Czechs must assist this process, and this is part of our path to greater democracy, freedom and living standards and a world at peace.

Colanti
John Playford

CIVILIAN MILITARISTS

The author discusses the expansion of strategic studies in Australian universities, the cold war concepts on which the studies are based and the dangers inherent in these developments.

Our problem has been that we expect the voice of terror to be frenzied, and that of madness irrational. It is quite the contrary in a world where genial, middle-aged Generals consult with precise social scientists about the parameters of the death equation, and the problem of its maximization.

IN AMERICA, the non-military advisers to the Defense Department, such as Herman Kahn, Thomas C. Schelling, Henry A. Kissinger and Albert Wohlstetter, have been aptly termed “crackpot realists” by C. Wright Mills and “The New Civilian Militarists” by Irving Louis Horowitz. Although not officially connected to any branch of the armed services, they have assumed the predominant influence in many areas of strategic policy. They have completely overwhelmed the military profession, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, in their contribution to the literature of strategic studies. They increasingly dominate the field of education and instruction in the subject. Indeed, with the exception of restricted fields of professional knowledge, the academic and quasi-academic centres of strategic studies have displaced the staff colleges and war colleges. Despite the grumbles of the generals, the civilian militarists have created a more flexible and more potent war machine than anything that could have been imagined by the old service-club approach of the career men in the armed services.

The new civilian militarists like to see themselves as presiding over the birth of a new academic science. In recent years, however, the validity of their methods, their utility to society and their integrity of purpose have all been called into question. Their morality needs scrutinising according to some critics, while others argue that it is the scientific adequacy of their claims. In The War Game (1963), Horowitz indicted those men trained in the strategy and tactics of military terrorism who, under the protection of university and government agencies claim and proclaim their ‘neutrality’.

with respect to social and political values. They replace problems of principles with matters of strategy. They prefer thinking about the unthinkable at the costs of any examination of what is possible and preferable. They inhabit a world of nightmarish intellectual 'play' while ridiculing the 'ossification' of American military posture. They seem to prefer 'advisory' positions and leave to politicians the actual tasks of acting out their recommendations (how else can they claim to be 'value neutral' with respect to scientific canons). In brief, they are 'military' minds with 'civilian' status.

Others extend the terms of the indictment beyond either the complete absence of morality or moral obscurantism. Philip Green, whose writings constitute the most formidable critique of "the new intellectual imperialism" of the civilian militarists, argues that they are to be condemned for being pseudo-scientific in their methods. They rely on a method of "scientific" analysis and a logic of "rational" action that obscures discussion of basic issues, rather than confronting the primarily political and moral questions of the nuclear age. The specialist techniques they employ, such as game theory and systems analysis, are bogus when used to arrive at strategic decisions and merely give an air of expertise to positions arrived at in an arbitrary and subjective manner. These partisan strategic analysts confuse propagandist-salesmanship with science and their pseudo-science is a disservice to the scholarly community. In Deadly Logic (1966), Green argued that their work has nothing to do with 'science'. To use inappropriate techniques that permit analysis to consist wholly of the manipulation of one's own prejudices; to rest one's theorizing on an assumption that already contains in it the conclusions that one wishes to reach—this is exactly the opposite of what genuine scientists in any field actually do.

They assume, he went on, that questions of policy are beyond debate, thereby simply not discussing the crucial propositions that one makes about world conflict. In other words, they engage in "the vice of the depoliticalization of the political: the attempt to fit essentially political questions into the strait jacket of so-called scientific analysis."2

---

The institutionalized study of strategic problems in academic and quasi-academic centres outside the defence establishment is of course most developed in the United States. In Britain, the best-known research centre is The Institute for Strategic Studies, but the scale of its work cannot be compared with the semi-official American research organisations such as the RAND Corporation or the Institute of Defense Analyses. Academic interest in strategic problems is underdeveloped in Australia where until recently the Australian Institute of International Affairs (AIIA) stood virtually alone. Academics have always played a crucial role in the activities of the AIIA, although the organisation is not officially attached to any university. The present Federal President is Professor Norman Harper, an historian at Melbourne University and a former Chairman of the Research Committee, who was succeeded in the latter post by Professor B. D. Beddie, a political scientist at the Australian National University. The former Federal President was Professor Gordon Greenwood, an historian at the University of Queensland. Sir Alan Watt, the full-time Director of the AIIA, and a former Secretary of the Department of External Affairs, works from an office in the Department of International Relations at the ANU, whose head is Professor J. D. B. Miller, editor of *Australian Outlook* which is published quarterly by the AIIA.


The new civilian militarists have been defended locally by Hedley Bull, Professor of International Relations at the ANU since 1966 and former Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Research Unit in the British Foreign Office, in “Strategic Studies and Its Critics”, *World Politics* July 1968. For a critique of Bull’s position, see Max Teichmann, “Strategy, Science and Morals”, *Pacific*, Nov.-Dec. 1967.


In recent years there has been a substantial expansion of the activities of the AIIA. A grant of US $75,000 from the Ford Foundation in 1962, conditional on the appointment of a full-time Director, enabled a three-year research project on Australia's relations with South-east Asia to be undertaken. To cover additional costs and make provision for the expansion of work after the Ford grant was exhausted, the AIIA launched a public appeal in 1964 for $200,000. The appeal was launched by the Minister for External Affairs and the Federal Government also helped by making contributions tax-deductible. A useful sum was collected, but the target figure was not achieved. As it turned out, the Ford Foundation again came to the rescue in March 1968 with a further grant of US $100,000 for a second third-year project on Australia's relations with South-east Asia.5

Another grant from the Ford Foundation, the size of which was undisclosed, enabled the ANU to establish in 1963 the Defence Studies Project within the Department of Political Science. The grant came through the AIIA, and from 1963 to 1966 the Project was led by Professor A. L. Burns. In September 1964 it conducted a seminar of military personnel, public servants and academics who considered the conditions of dispersal of nuclear weapons about the Indian and Pacific Oceans and the conditions under which Australia might become an owner or a host. The authors of the three papers presented at the Conference openly declared their assumption that no matter what military or economic inadequacies were revealed in China at the time of writing, sooner or later she must become strong and therefore a threat to surrounding nations and to Australia.6

The gradual awakening of academic interest in strategic studies in Australia led one of its leading proponents, Dr. T. B. Millar of the Department of International Relations at the ANU, to look optimistically into the future when he addressed the annual conference of the Australian Regional Groups of the Royal Institute of Public Administration in November 1965 on the need for developing institutionalized study of strategic problems:

We have lived for so long in our political backwater that we came to believe that strategy was something that concerned our allies but not us. And our Government, which appeared to have discovered the secret of perpetual rule, aided by a bureaucracy which did not especially want its comfortable seclusion invaded, convinced us for a long time that defence was a subject which could safely be left to the experts inside the high stone walls along St. Kilda Road. Perhaps Russell Hill has caught the winds of change. Perhaps such few

---


6 A. L. Burns, Nina Heathcote and G. P. King, Nuclear Dispersal in Asia and the Indo-Pacific Region (Canberra: Australian Institute of International Affairs and The Australian National University, 1965.)
academics as are seriously interested in defence are believed to be a rather more potentially respectable bunch these days. Perhaps the Viet Cong and Dr. Sukarno have aroused us all to an awareness of the dangers around us and the need of an informed public opinion to help produce or accept the necessary measures to meet them. Whatever the reason, it does seem that a better relationship is developing between all those in the community who are concerned about defence matters.7

The gap between Russell Hill and Acton rapidly closed in the second half of 1966 with the establishment of the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre at the ANU,8 which incorporated the facilities of the Defence Studies Project. Its gestation period, however, did not proceed quite as smoothly as its initiators had anticipated. In the Australian Financial Review (3 Aug. 1966), Maximilian Walsh reported that there was a strong division of opinion at the ANU on the proposal to set up the Centre. A meeting of the heads of departments attached to the Research School of Pacific Studies discussed the scheme, but the opposition was so strong that its proponents avoided putting any recommendation to the vote. The chief objection recorded was the high content of classified information likely to be contained in papers emanating from projects sponsored by the Centre. The dependence of Centre personnel on access to classified material would result, it was felt, in an impingement on the academic independence of the Centre, since its staff would have to be cleared with both the Department of Defence and the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation. The critics also argued that the source of the Centre’s funds could link its work too closely to the general aims of US foreign policy. Nevertheless, one of the leading proponents of the Centre, Sir John Crawford, the then Director of the Research School of Pacific Studies and subsequently Vice-Chancellor of the ANU, told Walsh that he intended to press ahead with the proposal. He also strongly denied the allegation that the Ford Foundation had offered to finance the Centre. Subsequently, Tribune (24 Aug. 1966) reported that two representatives from the Ford Foundation had arrived at the ANU just before the meeting of departmental heads in the Research School of Pacific Studies. A subsequent item in the Australian Financial Review (19 Aug. 1966) stated that some opposition to the Centre had been eliminated by the decision that its research projects would not be classified, but other critics feared that classification would probably be introduced at a later stage.

These fears were far from groundless. In the previous year, Millar had drawn attention to the use that the US Administration made of non-government defence and strategic experts from the universities and organizations such as the RAND Corporation,

before suggesting that the aid of academics should be enlisted in Australia. Reviewing the book, Malcolm Fraser, MHR, who became Minister for the Army shortly afterwards, pointed out that Millar had not mentioned that the academics who participated in the American research projects underwent a security classification which involved certain restraints and vows of silence on those involved.

Fraser then posed the question: "Would Australian academics and defence publicists be prepared to undergo similar restraints?". Indeed, Millar himself had raised the problem during his address to the Royal Institute of Public Administration in November 1965:

There are certainly security problems in associating academics and research institutions in activities involving classified information, but they are not insoluble. Each individual must be security cleared, and proper precautions taken over documents or materials or processes. Only those initiates who do not wish to share the sanctum believe that it is impossible to do so without rending the veil.

Despite the opposition of a number of senior ANU academics, the Centre was speedily established. Not unexpectedly, Millar was appointed to the position of Executive Officer, the "climax"—to quote the Australian Financial Review—of "a meteoric rise in the academic sphere" since he joined the ANU as a Research Fellow in International Relations in June 1962. In August 1964 he was appointed Fellow and promoted to the position of Senior Fellow in July 1966. In 1968 he moved up another rung in the academic ladder to the position of Professional Fellow. Graduating from the Royal Military College at Duntroon in 1944, Millar served as an infantry officer in the AIF at Morotai and later with BCOF in Japan. After the war he resigned from the Army and took his B.A. degree from the University of Western Australia. Moving to Melbourne as a teacher at Huntingtower School, conducted by the Christian Science Church, to which he belongs, Millar worked part time towards his M.A. at Melbourne University which he completed in 1958. The thesis topic was the "History of the Defence Forces of the Port Phillip District and Colony of Victoria 1836-1900". He then proceeded to the University of London, where he gained his Ph.D. in 1960. Before transferring to the ANU in 1962, he lectured in military history at Duntroon.

Millar holds strong public political views, going well beyond those civilian militarists who merely call for increased defence


expenditure and the importance of maintaining the American alliance. At the first university “teach-in” on Vietnam at the ANU in 1965, he supported Australian intervention, along with Peter Samuel and Tom Hughes, Liberal MHR. A report of his speech in The Australian (24 July 1965) indicated that he believed the situation in South Vietnam was like the two Australian Communist Parties amalgamating under the leadership of the “Chinese” group and, with encouragement and assistance from the Communist governments of New Zealand and Indonesia, beginning in Queensland “a campaign of terror, or murder, coercion and persuasion aimed at taking over the nation by force.” Moreover, he pointed out, the insurrection broke out while “Sir James Cairns” was Prime Minister. Millar’s principal argument in favour of Australian intervention was that “we are committed to the defence of South Vietnam by the Seato treaty.” Unless we assist the United States in Vietnam, we cannot expect them to help us when we are in trouble. In any event, he concluded in a vain attempt to silence the critics, “The Government has access to far more information than we have.” It is interesting to note that Millar has not spoken at any subsequent “teach-ins” on Vietnam, and has refused an invitation to participate in one at Monash, but he still strongly supports Australian intervention.

Millar is especially critical of those Australians who are opposed to Australia’s intervention in South Vietnam. In Australian Neighbours (July-Aug. 1965), published by the AIIA, he made the following comment on Australian defence and foreign policy:

I feel many of the criticisms to be misguided, and feel that a large proportion of the critics would change their attitudes if they were obliged to forsake the luxury of opposition for the responsibilities of formulating and implementing government policy. Much of the criticism appears to be based on the theory that we should trust and cultivate (or bribe?) potential enemies while distrusting and refusing to assist or support acknowledged friends.

Non-Communist critics, he continued, “tend to equate communism with all that is natural, inevitable, progressive, wholesome and democratic.” The United States “stands in the way of the Chinese expansion.” The Indians “have become much more appreciative of the value of friends in the West since their experience of a Chinese invasion.”

On this last point, it would be interesting to hear Millar’s views on the writings of Dr. Alastair Lamb, not to mention a statement by General Maxwell Taylor in testimony before the US Congress in which he admitted that India started the Sino-Indian border war of 1962 by militarily “edging forward in the disputed area.” (UPI, 18 April 1963).

Another theme frequently stressed by Millar is that the “Viet Cong” are simply “terrorists”. In an ABC broadcast several years
ago which was later included in a booklet entitled *Ferment in Asia* (edited by Professor Norman Harper), Millar summed up the “Viet Cong” as a “powerful internal terrorist army”:

North Viet Nam seeks to extend its Communist system over the south and into Laos and perhaps Cambodia. Only the United States, massive and alien, stands in the way. The Americans seek to contain Chinese hegemony; to limit Hanoi’s control to North Viet Nam; to prove that the Communist model of subversion and revolutionary warfare is not inevitable and invariably successful, even with an adjoining Communist state; to maintain the right of small nations to exist.

United States’ measures to assist economic, social and political developments in South Vietnam, Millar wrote in *The Bulletin* (6 March 1965), “have largely failed for a single basic reason: the systematic campaign of murder and sabotage by the Vietcong designed to deny the aid to the South Vietnamese people.” Were the U.S. to withdraw from South Vietnam, he continued, “the whole of its carefully-fostered and genuinely deserved reputation in Asia as a bulwark against Communism and a support against poverty would be irreparably damaged.”

“Chinese expansionism” was the basic assumption of Millar’s paper on “Australia’s Defence Needs” which appeared in *Australia’s Defence and Foreign Policy* (1964), edited by John Wilkes:

That the Chinese People’s Republic, with its standing army of some three million men, has supported and will support subversion, revolution, and even overt invasion throughout South-East Asia in an attempt to ensure that the region is controlled by communist governments sympathetic or preferably subordinate to China; and that if China were to gain control of the mainland, Australia would be in a very difficult position. Thus in helping to defend South Vietnam, Thailand and Malaysia, Australia contributes directly to its own defence.

Australia, he continued, was helping to defend South Vietnam from “externally-backed communist subversion, infiltration, terrorism and aggression.” Moreover, “We need to ensure that our servicemen are ideologically armed — not ‘indoctrinated’, but aware of the great benefits of the democratic way of life, and the Christian values which are the basis of our society.” In this paper, and in his other writings, he argued both that “we must prepare now to meet the future threat”, and that China is at present both unable and unwilling to invade Australia.

In fact, in his major work to date — *Australia’s Defence* (1965) — Millar is even more contradictory, as one of his persistent critics, Max Teichmann, pointed out in *Arena*, Summer 1966, and also in a paper on “Non-Alignment — A Policy for Australia” in *Aspects of Australia’s Defence* (1966). On the one hand, Millar referred to the “expanding imperialism of the Chinese People’s Republic” (p.31); on the other hand, we were told that not only does China not have the means to launch an invasion of Australia but that
“it would seem unlikely, at this stage, that the Chinese Government has any desire to do such a thing.” (p.59)

These quotations should be sufficient to make clear the intensity with which Millar holds Cold War assumptions, and also his tendency to denigrate opponents on the grounds of naivete or worse. Not surprisingly, then, we note an item in News-Weekly (12 Oct. 1966) announcing that forthcoming speakers before the Canberra Branch of the Defend Australia Committee, the leading pro-Vietnam lobby group in the country, would be Senator F. P. McManus of the DLP, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, the Minister for the Army, and Dr. T. B. Millar.

Millar’s Cold War assumptions are not shared by all non-Communist specialists. Thus we find two young Australian social scientists writing as follows:

The fact that China has given aid and comfort to her allies in neighbouring countries, that she has taken strong measures to subjugate an area juridically regarded as part of China, and that she has made a brief foray into India (over a border dispute as genuine as such disputes can ever be, and probably under provocation) should not deceive us into thinking that Communist China has performed any acts comparable to the international aggressions of the 1930’s and 1940’s.12

Even more interesting are two evaluations of China in 1966 by Alastair Buchan, Director of the Institute for Strategic Studies in London, and by Roderick MacFarquhar, editor of The China Quarterly, published by the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Buchan described China’s objectives as follows:

It is very easy to put together the stream of abusive editorials in the Peking Daily with the facts of China’s population, her nuclear weapons programme— and her agricultural poverty, to create a nightmare prospect of an over-populated and vindictive great nation expanding in every direction, and provoking the first nuclear war in the process. It seems to me there is little justification, certainly in Mao’s statements, for this view... Certainly China would like to recover her influence over areas like Vietnam and Laos, as to some extent she has done over Cambodia, and this leads her to be an active supporter of indigenous revolutionary movements. But she has never promoted any internal ‘wars of liberation’, only encouraged them where they develop naturally. I can see no evidence that she wishes for a satellite empire in Asia, while there are clear signs that she is becoming increasingly absorbed in her own domestic and political problems.

12 Anthony Clunies Ross and Peter King, Australia and Nuclear Weapons (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1966), pp.56-57. Millar’s most recent work, Australia’s Foreign Policy (Sydney: Angus & Robertson 1968), continues to argue that China is a military threat to Australia although not an immediate one, and that the threat must be met mainly by military measures. “In fifty years time (Australia) could be a Great Power — or a granary tributary of an Asian empire.” For a critical review of the book by a fellow firm believer in the desirability of continuing Australian-American alliance, see Milton Osborne in The Age, 14 Sept. 1968.
There were “no signs that she is losing her innate caution, or that she wishes to rule Asia by force.” Consequently:

If this view of Chinese policy is correct, there is no case for creating an integrated military coalition of her powerful neighbours and the external powers to ‘contain’ her physically as the Soviet Union had to be ‘contained’ in Western and South-eastern Europe in the 1950’s.

Successive US Secretaries of State from Dean Acheson to Dean Rusk, he concluded, have wrongly described China as an aggressive power which must be physically confined by direct military confrontation.13

MacFarquhar noted that “there is little evidence to suggest that the Chinese are interested in actively trying to initiate or master-mind subversion abroad.” Moreover, “Mao does not think in terms of the aggressive use of force, even in the absence of countervailing American power, except in the case of the ‘restoration area’, and not necessarily even there.” Fear of Chinese expansionism, MacFarquhar concluded, is “mistaken.”14

Let us now examine some of the activities of the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, whose Advisory Committee comprises Professors Sir John Crawford, H. W. Arndt, B. D. Beddie, Hedley Bull, A. L. Burns J. D. B. Miller, P. H. Partridge and W. E. H. Stanner of the ANU, the ubiquitous Sir Alan Watt and of course Dr. T. B. Millar. In September 1967, the Centre held its first major conference, a seminar on Britain’s withdrawal from Asia, whose proceedings were edited by Millar and published under the title Britain’s Withdrawal from Asia: Its Implications for Australia. The Conference was private and attended by academics, public servants, parliamentarians, diplomats, and a selected group from the Press. Papers were presented by Millar himself, Professors J. D. B. Miller, A. L. Burns and W. E. H. Stanner, Mr. Geoffrey Fairbairn of the ANU, Dr. D. E. Kennedy of the University of Melbourne, Dr. H. G. Gelber of Monash University, and three journalists, Mr. Denis Warner (The Herald), Mr. Creighton Burns (The Age), and Mr. Peter Robinson (The Australian Financial Review). The published proceedings of the conference came out just before Britain definitely announced that it would be withdrawing east of Suez in the near future. Peter Samuel’s review in The Bulletin (13 Jan. 1968) was headed “Non-Policies from a Roomful of Tories”. The book, he began, was “an account of how our foreign affairs establishment protects itself against ideas.” Some of the papers were “outstandingly frivolous”, and he specifically cited H. G. Gelber’s suggesting that the British are not really disengaging, J. D. B. Miller’s gentilities on the need to consider foreign policies other than All-the-

way-with-LBJ (concluding with ‘They may not comfort us, but they do make us think’) and D. E. Kennedy’s parade of well-worn points about SEATO which evoked, in discussion, the priceless conclusion that an alliance ‘less specifically opposed to Communism might appear desirable, but against whom would it be directed?’

Millar’s mistake, Samuel concluded, was in not inviting along to his seminar people “who might have shaken his conservatives a little in their rut. A Santamaria, a Knopfelmacher, a Cooksey, a Colin Clark, or a Teichmann or two were desperately needed.” For the record, it should be made public that Max Teichmann was not invited, despite the fact that he had argued that Britain’s withdrawal from Southeast Asia was inevitable in a paper at the 1965 conference of the Australasian Political Studies Association and in an article entitled “Protecting Ourselves” in the Spring 1966 issue of Dissent.

Seminars are also held regularly at the Centre and speakers from outside the ANU have included Douglas Pike, author of Viet Cong, G. Jockel of the Department of External Affairs, Air Marshal E. Reyno of the Royal Canadian Air Force, Group Captain D. B. Nichols, Director of Legal Services in the RAAF, and Professor Lincoln P. Bloomfield, a former senior State Department official now at the Centre for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which was financed until recently by the C.I.A.

One revealing aspect of the Centre’s work is their current interest in the techniques of counterinsurgency warfare. They have already held one seminar on the subject and there will be another in the near future. There are no indications to date that they intend to emulate such large-scale exercises in “counter-insurgent prophylaxis” as Project Camelot, sponsored a few years ago by the US Army under the aegis of the American University and eventually cancelled by former Defence Secretary Robert McNamara following widespread criticism in Latin America. The old formula for counterinsurgency used to be ten soldiers for every guerrilla. Now the formula appears to be ten social scientists for every guerrilla. Counterinsurgency projects implicitly identify revolution and radical social change with social pathology, and order and stability with social health. Their general purpose is to reduce the likeli-


hood of social disturbances or revolutions in the Third World. The possibility that all or some revolutions may be justified or desirable is not considered, nor is any interest shown in how to assist Left insurgency movements in dealing with dictatorial governments of the Right. Implicit in the concept of "counter-insurgency" is an assumption that revolutionary movements are dangerous to the interests of "the free world" and that the US and its close allies must be prepared to assist counterrevolutionary measures to repress these movements. Professor Edgar S. Furniss, Director of the Mershon Social Science Program in National Security at Ohio State University, has warned that counterinsurgency theorizing, like deterrence theorizing, is "equally poisonous for social science study and research."16 And Conor Cruise O'Brien has argued convincingly that many social and political scientists accept, although they do not proclaim, the principle of "counterrevolutionary subordination." One can assume the continued promotion by the United States and its satellites of counterrevolution in the underdeveloped countries, and in this kind of situation the real danger to academic integrity comes from "counterrevolutionary subordination."17

It is undeniable that some scholarly research is being undertaken at the Centre, but the world's problems are defined in terms extremely close to what the Left feels to be the perception of world problems held by the Australian Government.

Relations between the Centre and the defence departments are cordial. Although no formal links exist, the Centre has effective access to government and they certainly hope to influence government policy. A peace institution on the other hand, not only would be denied these informal links but it would be neither as influential nor as well-financed. Some of the projects already undertaken at the Centre are sober and serious pieces of research, but they are wholly within the framework of the Cold War perspective. The American counterparts of the Centre and the quasi-academic institutes like the RAND Corporation are unquestionably oriented towards the general perspectives, if not always the concrete policies, of the American foreign policy elite. They hold the same important assumptions as the official United States position, and these basic assumptions are not put to any kind of test. In the case of RAND, although its research workers have been intellectually independent to the extent of strenuously questioning their employer's policies, they have not been "independent" to the extent of questioning

16 Introduction to Green, Deadly Logic, p.ix.

17 Conor Cruise O'Brien, "Politics and the Morality of Scholarship", in Max Black (ed.), The Morality of Scholarship (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), p.71. It is believed that the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre at the ANU has recently begun a substantive study of nuclear weapons for Australia.
either the nature of the jobs they are performing or their basic values. As Max Teichmann wrote in the Spring 1967 issue of *Dissent* when discussing social science institutes or projects in receipt of CIA or US military finance:

Such an institute need not produce loaded or contaminated research—but it will be influenced by a distorted order of research priorities. Some avenues of research and some hypotheses would almost certainly be excluded, for fear of producing unpalatable conclusions or unacceptable prescriptions. Thus how many US foundations would go on financing a Military Institute which started producing studies showing the desirability of unilateral nuclear disarmament, or armed neutrality, or the dangers of stationing US bases on its soils, or historical analysis showing that America was mainly responsible for maintaining the Cold War, or demonstrations that the US was conducting subversion of other countries by the use of the CIA and its innumerable fronts? Yet research bodies in these fields which dodge such enquiries . . . are, intellectually speaking not worth a cracker.

Where does the Centre obtain its funds? When it was being established Sir John Crawford had adamantly denied rumours of financial assistance from the Ford Foundation, but today the ANU publicly acknowledges that the funds are coming from this source. The Ford Foundation in fact has been the most active foundation in the broad field of international relations, including grants to establish and maintain the Institute for Strategic Studies in London. Professor Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago has commented on

the enormous positive and negative influence which foundations exert upon the objects, results, and methods of research. They reward certain types of research by supporting them and stimulate more research of the same type by promising to support it. On the other hand, they thwart or make impossible other types of research by not supporting them. The political scientist who wants to share in these rewards and, by doing so, gain prestige and power within the profession cannot help being influenced by these positive and negative expectations in his concept of the social truth of the methods by which to seek it, and of the relevant results to be expected from it.]8

The assumptions of the Cold War are accepted by the Ford Foundation. Thus it favours projects in which all questions are submerged to the national interest. Writing in *The Village Voice* (6 July 1967), two young New Left social scientists, Todd Gitlin and Bob Ross, noted that the consequences of a grant from the CIA, the State Department or the Ford Foundation, were identical — “to expedite America’s foreign penetrations, and to render them legitimate; to decorate the gendarmerie of the world with ribbons of rationality and liberalism.” Looking at the claim that the Congress for Cultural Freedom’s newly-found ties with the Ford Foundation

---

indicated that it was no longer a Cold War instrument, *I. F. Stone's Weekly* (3 April 1967) commented:

Frankly, we don't think the shift from CIA to Ford makes much difference. The Ford Foundation, with McGeorge Bundy at its head, like the Rockefeller Foundation, which Dean Rusk long ran, are part of the same pompous American establishment... These stuffed shirt institutions are no more likely to finance independent and critical writing on American policy in Vietnam or Latin America than would the CIA.

And Conor Cruise O'Brien has maintained that the way in which international political studies are today supported and organized in America involves manipulation:

Many of these studies, both respectable and other, are financed either by some branch of the United States government or by some foundation whose policies are the same as those of the United States government, from which it may even acquire its highest personnel. When we find that many of these studies also distort reality, in a sense favorable to US policy and reassuring to US opinion, it is apparent that here the morality of scholarship has been exposed to temptation and in some cases has succumbed with enthusiasm.19

The role of civilian militarists in Australia will certainly become more important in the next few years. Already *The Australian* (8 May 1968) has editorialised on the urgent need for a "think tank", along the lines of the RAND Corporation, to modernise Australian military organisation and strategic thinking. It was immediately joined by Professor Hedley Bull who told a defence forum at the University of Melbourne that the rigid division between public servants and armed forces personnel on the one hand and academics, parliamentarians and journalists on the other, impoverished thinking about defence matters on both sides. He added that the Australian defence machine needed to be subjected to the sort of "intellectually rigorous political, strategic and economic analysis" that transformed the American war machine under former Secretary of Defence Robert McNamara — a transformation in which the key role was performed by the RAND Corporation, (*The Australian*, 8 May 1968).

There has been a clear connection between the "disinterested" scientist and America's arsenal of exotic weaponry, between the "dispassionate" anthropologist and the domination of primitive peoples, between the "objective" sociologist and the manipulation of power elites in under-developed countries, and between the academic centre of strategic studies and counterinsurgency warfare. As Irving Louis Horowitz noted when he entered a plea for moving beyond the findings of the civilian militarists, such a step would be to move into "a clearer and cleaner use of social and political science."20

---

19 O'Brien, *op.cit.*, p.70.

A leader of the Young Socialists raises a point of view about the unions and discusses the need for greater efforts to secure wider participation by unionists in policy making and activity.

THE AGE OF "AFFLUENCE", technological change and the computer, have caught up and passed the Australian trade union movement. The problem now is whether the unions will be rejuvenated sufficiently to play a leading role in society or whether they will fall even further behind.

I believe that this question is absolutely urgent and that unless the answer is found within the next few years, it will be too late. Interesting figures as to the present tendencies are as follows: between 1961 and 1965 the proportion of unionists amongst wage and salary earners decreased from 51 per cent to 50 per cent in Victoria. In New South Wales the 10-year period 1954-64 saw a decline from 61 per cent to 56 per cent (NSW and Victorian Year Books): This is despite the fact that the overall work force from the intellectually trained to the unskilled is growing as a percentage of the population. The 1967 Victorian Year Book shows that of those occupied in the work force, including employers to employees, the employees have grown from 81.3 per cent in 1954 to 82.6 per cent in 1961, and we can confidently say that this process would have quickened since 1961. Other figures show that many of the blue collar unions are declining in membership, while white collar unions are growing. These figures seem to indicate that the white collar unions are not attracting people quickly enough to offset the losses in the blue collar unions, and that as more young people now move into white collar fields it is probably they who are not joining. On the other hand more and more migrants are filling the unskilled and semi-skilled jobs so maybe it is they who are not being attracted.

Unions are today seldom regarded as a dynamic force and are often thought to be losing relevance in society. To some, they appear to have become "integrated" and to be almost part and parcel of the Establishment. None of these views is entirely correct,
although each contains partial truths. In a society which has increasingly complex problems, there is objectively a greater role for unions than ever, as is being displayed in isolated instances. On the economic front one only has to recall the massive metal trades struggles earlier this year to see that such actions are far from redundant. No, it is not the specific objective conditions so much (many of which are probably here to stay), as the need to rethink the role of unions and associations within the revolutionary framework.

In recent years there has been a spate of marxist rethinking on a host of questions such as democracy, alienation, transitional programs, perspectives within socialism, class motivations and so on. Not very much has filtered through to the union movement yet, although it is gathering pace. What is required now is to start transferring some of this new thinking into concrete reality, and here surely is where the unions start to reveal their potential. We have a unique situation. Over 50 per cent of working people are in a union or professional association—one of the highest membership rates in the capitalist world. We have one major centre uniting blue collar unionists and a fast growing unity of and with the increasingly important white collar and technical unions. To top it all the Australian Council of Trade Unions gives lip service at least to the eventual establishment of some kind of socialism. If that is not an important base on which to build, we'll never have one.

What is needed is ramified union organisation, firmly under the control of the rank and file and involved with almost every facet of a unionist's life. Such things as cultural activities, clubs, children's organisations, housing co-operatives, educational institutions, medical centres, etc., run by the membership, would begin to give meaning to participatory democracy. A big barrier is that many union leaderships have become so obsessed with constant wage cases that little time is given to anything else. In fact the skilful moves of the ruling class have trapped us into these interminable antics, in a very conscious attempt to enmesh the unions in Establishment processes.

To some extent unions have developed an acquisitive mentality because of their concentration on economic demands. This has led to higher incomes and material standards, but has not consciously assisted in improving moral judgments, cultural appreciation, political understanding and a more fully developed person. In fact the result is quite the contrary.

Perhaps we should get down to some concrete examples to see what can be done. Shop committees and local branches should be the springboard, as illustrated by a couple of examples from
the Preston tramway workshop. Several years ago a seminar on Indonesia was held at different lunch time meetings, with four speakers, ranging from Catholic to Communist. The attendances were good, showing this was an effective way of moving outside ordinary union affairs. In another innovation, for the first ACTU Youth Week the shop committee organised a function in the Preston Town Hall with the full support of the council. This has become an expanding and permanent feature of youth week, reaching out to secondary students, church youth clubs and sporting organisations. Now the idea of a whole week of youth activity in Preston is being put forward. Some time ago the committee had a lunch time meeting to hear about the forthcoming fortieth anniversary of Preston. This led to the establishment of the Preston Historical Society, which is now a thriving organisation.

Shop committees in fact should become the focal point for most activity within work places and factories. This would mean supplanting the employer-sponsored social clubs which are often used as a sop. There is no reason why shop committees should not be able to run socials, sporting events, cultural activities, etc., a whole lot better. In the cultural field, for example, ACTU Youth Week factory gate folk concerts have proved a winner, like poetry reading during the last Adelaide Arts Festival. Why should these not become regular features of workshop life, instead of being presented just once a year? If sufficient support is engendered, surely it becomes possible for unions to consider sponsoring tours and concerts by international artists, Pete Seeger for example, and even developing their own theatres. The same kind of program can be envisaged for local branches, which should be able to take part in local affairs and activities in a big way.

Turning to bigger projects requiring overall leadership, we already have the Butchers' Union Trade Union Clinic in Footscray, which is winning itself a reputation with its research into industrial accidents and safety measures. Why should there not be a network of such clinics throughout the country? Then there is the new Teachers' Federation building and club in Sydney—an object lesson in the kind of atmosphere and facilities which must attract greater interest from members. The overall approach embodied in the Youth Week concept has proved useful, the weakness being its once a year format which does not follow up activities. The development of "FOCO" in Brisbane is perhaps the most shining example that young people can be won to some kind of allegiance with the unions, given the right approach. To prove the point, as a result of "FOCO" 5,000 young people turned up to the opening function of this year's Youth Week.

In the field of education, the unions could consider the establishment of cheap coaching classes to assist members' children
doing Matric and Leaving. At present, this avenue is left wide open for profitmaking concerns and surely a young person so assisted would be impressed by the unions' concern for his education. Ideas presented by G. W. Ford in *The Australian Trade Unions* are very useful, especially the suggestion that unions have to emulate the employer and go into secondary schools to sell unionism, so that those starting work will have some understanding of its value. We should certainly take up his idea for a union-produced handbook on trade unions for use in schools.

It would also be worthwhile for unions to consider granting scholarships, especially for research into matters of concern to them. As a further move to develop student-worker cooperation, consideration could be given to a liaison committee between university SRC's or Labor Clubs and Trades and Labor Councils or groups of unions. This would be of mutual benefit during big campaigns.

Children’s activity also deserves attention. Some unions have dance groups, picnics and pages in their journals, but perhaps we could develop union-sponsored kindergartens or nurseries. This would also present a good opportunity to bring housewives into activity. A further project could be cheap holiday camps for members’ children.

To do these things, far more streamlined organisation is necessary and less involvement with the mundane tasks. In this regard the AEU is setting the pace with its complete re-organisation and use of computers to reduce the time-consuming administrative work, the whole object being to free local branches, organisers and members precisely for extending the union’s activity and in such a way as to involve the rank and file more than ever. Already one branch is planning to establish its own local centre for activities and recreation, and another has begun to look into local problems of social services and public facilities with the object of initiating campaigns. The AEU experiences will need to be followed closely, as with its job organisation and branches it could become an example of what the whole movement can do.

This type of involvement in every facet of life does not mean that we turn from campaigning to simply emulating the government and the boss in providing services. Quite the contrary, because this must be seen as revolutionary strategy and not simply popularisation of unionism. It is precisely under a socialist society that unions will provide schools, universities, hospitals, holiday camps, theatres, etc. etc., so we will in fact be building in embryo form the people’s organisations which will eventually control such things.
The very concept of workers' control becomes more relevant surely when unionists see their potential, while involved with a network of union undertakings. In fact within such a movement the alternative power structures can grow, on which we will build the new society.

We must constantly keep in front of us the demand for rank and file control of all campaigns and projects. This becomes a concrete example of socialist democracy in contrast to our lack of participation and control of capitalist institutions. Democracy must be at the very centre of our thinking on the modernisation of unions. The rightwing concept of modernisation is the employment of experts and leaders to take over and handle everything, and no doubt this is a serious trap into which we could fall inadvertently. Because of the complex problems confronting the unions, we would need the advice of experts, but not control. Some well-meaning people have suggested that unions should invest their money, as a way to modernise. This would be entirely wrong, as they are immediately turned into their opposites with vested interests in preventing conflict. Money should be spent in those fields where it will provide a useful service for members: theatres, clubs, colleges, etc., and no doubt such ventures would also prove profitable.

Close involvement with important social undertakings and problems would lead to a deeper understanding and a better capacity for militant action around such things as social service, education, housing and so on. The Living Standards Conferences held in both Sydney and Melbourne turned into abortive attempts to broaden horizons. No doubt rightwing bureaucracy and lack of clear-sighted approach on the part of the left contributed to the poor follow up from these excellent beginnings. Nevertheless another factor was that they were a flash in the pan. If factory and branch organisations had been deeply involved in the wide range of issues discussed, vigorous action would probably have developed and this would have been more difficult to bottle up afterwards. With the accepted practice of wide involvement will no doubt come a more ready acceptance of political action, which will obviously be necessary in many issues. In such circumstances the issue of peace will surely be regarded more as an ordinary part of activity than at the moment.

During the course of this development the vexing problem of which social group is the main force for change will probably be solved. A movement with a dynamic approach and challenging ideas can attract as allies students, academics and other progressives. Based on purely material concepts it may be said that the industrial working class is redundant as a revolutionary force. However this perhaps ignores the important role of ideas, which
can be introduced into the movement, and this has been seriously lacking of recent times. It may be a little easier to introduce socialist consciousness to the better educated white collar workers, especially as the technological revolution develops. Nevertheless such consciousness does not appear spontaneously and will need to be tackled differently among different sections of the working people. The important thing is that a union movement with a socialist consciousness oriented towards all working people, students, academics, housewives, pensioners end children, and not just to a particular section, will surely be capable of social change.

Finally, I agree with G. W. Ford in the essay mentioned earlier when he says that modernisation is absolutely urgent. What is required is a new revolutionary strategy for the trade unions, and we need to start developing it immediately. No doubt there are many well informed academics who would be pleased to assist if approached, and this would be a good start. We need to start posing new challenging ideas and framing programs for next year’s ACTU Congress, and winning support from the rank and file to back them up. We have the job of breaking the ACTU obsession with arbitration and wage cases which are making the unions simply an appendage of the courts. We need to break through leftwing bureaucracy and conservatism which seriously retards a lot of work, and thus give full rein to initiative. The development of rank and file activity with far-sighted leadership and assistance should be able to discredit and weaken the rightwing. The possibility then opens up of building a union movement with revolutionary potential. I can only stress again that the task is urgent and must start NOW!

Contributions and comments from readers are welcome, and should be sent to Australian Left Review, Box A247, Sydney South Post Office 2000.

To meet printing schedules, articles are normally required one month before date of issue — the first day of every second month.

Contributions for the discussion pages should not exceed 1,000 words.—Ed.
Rupert Lockwood

RACISM AND MILITARISM

A well known communist publicist and labor historian traces the connection between conscription and the White Australia Policy.

FROM THE POST-WATERLOO era to the 1955 Menzies Government intervention in Malaya, a series of conflicts and agreements on Australia's military responsibilities colored relations with Britain. The main value in assessing past Australian resistance and acceptance in imperial military arrangements is to underscore the changes and the dissimilarities faced by anti-war and anti-conscription campaigners of the Vietnam era, who must operate under a Government bound to American rather than to British strategy, to Asian rather than to European and Middle East expeditionary force commitments. And the field of action is an Australia where monopoly corporations have by this developed vain and vaulting Asian ambitions of their own, which require that a great and powerful friend should hold the umbrella.

While recognising change and dissimilarity it is important to keep in mind that the same weapon is available today to those who would raise conscript armies for foreign adventures as was employed more than a century ago by the initiators of Australia's role as a colonial war base: the White Australia Policy. The White Australia Policy, once underwritten by the British Navy, has a new meaning in the age of Asian liberation. The metropolitan countries of imperialism and their "metropolitan extensions" like Australia and New Zealand were all beyond the reach of retaliatory action by peoples invaded, bombarded, ravaged and robbed. White Australia can no longer be sure of this exemption, or of freedom from a revived Japanese threat, now that Asia is on the road to full independence, France has been expelled, Britain has to retreat west of Suez and American imperial fortunes in the Pacific and Indian Ocean are fast waning.

The Australian metropolitan extension of Britain did not easily develop its resistance movements in the last century. So many of the original land-takers and officials came from military and naval families or jingoist middle-class and lower aristocrat groups; they were infected with the colonialist and white-supremacy attitudes of the time, and passionately loyal to the Mother Country. In military matters the colonial states often had to be pushed toward greater self-reliance.
The overseas British settlements' reluctance to assert national military dignity was indicative of the colonists' attachment to the Motherland. A 1836 petition came from Canada against British garrisons' withdrawal. When in 1871 the last British troops boarded the Orontes for home, the writers agreed it was a sad day for Canada. Newfoundland's pleas to retain the puny garrison of 300 were "piteous"; New Zealand gave up its British regiment "amid heartburnings". The Colonial Under-Secretary Knatchbull-Hugessen was almost tearful over the Treasury's rejection of Tasmania's claim for compensation in view of the loss of garrison spending . . . a loss much deplored.

"We have tainted it with our convicts... we have (temporarily) impoverished it by the withdrawal of troops," he said. Australian colonies at last offered to pay for imperial troops if they would not be withdrawn in emergencies, as had happened in Crimean, Afghan, Indian and anti-Maori wars. Secretary for War, Lord Cardwell was in 1868 flatly refusing to leave the overseas British with these symbols of their dependence . . . the redcoats. The last British troops sailed from Australia in 1870, and by 1873 the Cardwell broom had swept clean in the hands of the overseas British. The moist eyes at Sydney quays bore no resemblance to the scenes as the last defeated redcoats parted company with the British colonists of America.

Recruitment in Australia for British colonial wars began with the convicts. Significant numbers of Australian convicts, acceptable both as police and soldiers by a not-very-particular Motherland, fought Indians, the Afghans, Chinese, Maoris and others. And in the 1840's, Australia saw her initiation as an imperial place d'armes. N. N. Russell and Co., Sydney foundrymen, cast mortars, tried them out in the Sydney Domain and shipped them to New Zealand to ensure Maori Chief Honi Heke's defeat in 1846. Twenty-four pounder guns, cast in Sydney to shell Maori pahs, and oxen to haul them followed. (The first Australian Merchants of Death honored the traditions of their profession: Governor Gipps in Sydney had to display some energy to end the profitable Australian arms shipments to the Maori warriors).

This Maori war was the writing on the wall for those colonists who thought they could rely on Britain for military protection: Governor Fitzroy was to send away so many troops to New Zealand that N.S.W. and Victoria and even the Fort Macquarie convict settlement were virtually without garrisons. Convicts, wasters, deserters from whalers were used to supplement the Maori war forces. Thus a war for theft of Maori lands and extermination of the rightful occupiers, fought in utter dishonor, in breach of pledged word, ushered Australia into the world as a base for colonial
military expeditions. By this time Whitehall had already enunciated the White Australia Policy. Minister for Native Affairs Richmond, one of the directors of the war in N.Z., provided the idea for slogans: he described the way of life of the Maoris then being dispossessed at bayonet point as "beastly Communism."

Sir George Grey, British Viceroy in New Zealand, said that there should be enlisted "on the declining Victorian goldfields a few thousand men to fight the Maoris and then settle on land confiscated from the Maoris who had taken up arms against the Queen."

Some 2,500 from Australia donned jackets of "fine scarlet cloth, tastefully trimmed with silver," for "search and destroy" operations in which they burned Maori villages and killed Maoris; they often found that the Maoris were better soldiers than they, these displaced gold-diggers from Ballarat and Bendigo, these sweepings of Sydney and Melbourne streets and land-stealing adventurers. Reward for mercenary slaughter of Maoris was 50 acres and a town lot for a private, 60 acres for an Australian corporal, 80 for a sergeant, 200 for a subaltern and 300 for a captain. Their commander, Major-General Duncan Cameron, considered the Maori "a noble foeman worthy of British steel" and the colonial volunteers "greedy, land-hungry and pettifogging." A few humanitarians in Australia denounced the Maori wars.

The Maori wars marked an important turn in Anglo-Australian military relations. Australia had emerged as a supplier of manpower for colonial wars, since the gold rush had greatly augmented the population and left a redundant pool.

Britain's post-Waterloo ascendancy was ending; the rise of formidable imperial rivals forced her to draw more on the blood and bone of overseas Britons.

Volunteer movements gathered new strength and meaning. Brewer Sir Daniel Cooper (the Coopers are still big Tooth's shareholders) was generous with his money. James Burns, a founder of Burns, Philp and Co. (Parramatta Troop, N.S.W. Lancers), who already had South Seas ambitions, and Richard Windeyer, who provided a descendant for the imperial trust, Colonial Sugar Refining Co., were among the promoters of indigenous militarism.

Sir James Fairfax (Sydney Morning Herald) headed the Patriotic Fund to back the 1885 Sudan expedition. Acting N.S.W. Premier Dalley offered the troops without being asked by Britain: 800 men and 244 horses sailed from Sydney, captured a donkey, burned a few native huts and committed wanton vandalism at Tamai and elsewhere and were back home in four months without having been admitted to battle by the British.

The Sudan expedition perhaps brought the first line-up of imperialist v. anti-imperialist forces, and their sentiments have relevance today.
David Buchanan, the radical M.L.A., said the expedition was "scandalous in its illegality and inherent baseness." Under no circumstances should Australia send troops to fight in such wars. He denounced "this bloodthirsty enterprise of ours, where our men have gone forth to slay peoples with whom they have no quarrel, who have done them no harm, and who are engaged in a death struggle for their own rights and liberties, and against the bitterness of unbearable oppression." On the other side of the fence the "dollars for diggers" men of Korean and Vietnam war periods could have located predecessors. The Melbourne Argus said the despatch of Australian troops to the Sudan would win more British attention to "colonial wants and colonial interests." . . . "For every man we send to the Sudan," said the Sydney Morning Herald, "ten may come to replace him (as migrants) and every pound we spend may mean ten coming here for investments." And so it was when Australia sent 17,000 troops to the Boer War. The Register, for the Adelaide Establishment, said that the cost of Australian troops in South Africa would be "repaid twofold by appreciation of Australian credit in the financial markets of the Old World." Cardinal Moran, Catholic Primate, denounced "a raid by capitalists on a self-governing country."

The Echo of Sydney could not forget White Australia's "Yellow Peril" preoccupation when it hailed the Sudan expedition of 1885: "We have put on a complete manhood . . . In the watchful eye gigantic shapes of danger loom even now upon a near horizon." The idea was that if Australia helped Britain in Africa, Britain would defend White Australia against "Asian hordes." Sydney's streets were gay with cheers and bunting when an Australian expeditionary force sailed to help Tsarist Russians, Italians, Austrians, Americans, Japanese and British suppress China's Boxer Rebellion. "Yellow Peril" outpourings and imperial unity slogans were turned on ad nauseam. The Australian troops in China "punished many villages," blew up river junks, did police work and collected tickets on railways. Britain's General Sir Alfred Gaslee who commanded the Victorian and N.S.W. forces in China noted "how excellent a political effect has been produced by their appearance on so remote a stage as North China of these fine contingents from the Australian Commonwealth.

"They have been an object lesson not only to the foreigners, but also to our Indian subjects, of the patriotism which inspires all parts of the British Empire." Australian military expeditions could now be brandished as a threat against all Asians.

Britain supervised every step in the building up of Australian federal armed forces. Major-General Bevan Edwards was brought to Australia in 1889; he reported that Australian armed forces
must be organised on a federal basis, that there must be a uniform Defence Act, federal military college and federal munitions factory. This was, in effect, a demand for federation, and there is no doubt that British War Office pressure speeded the States into a Commonwealth. The Edwards report influenced the 1890 and 1891 federation conventions and, while the States bickered on other issues, they were unanimous for national defence. Rear-Admiral Henderson came from England to ask for an Australian Navy; the First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Fisher, and Admiral Sir George Tryon agitated for it. However much the Labor Party may claim credit for the Royal Australian Navy, defence was strictly bi-partisan and under British supervision. Liberal Prime Minister Alfred Deakin ordered the battle-cruiser *Australia* and the cruisers *Sydney* and *Melbourne* in 1909.

Labor Prime Minister Andrew Fisher was to carry out the plan put forward by the British war chief, Lord Kitchener, for a wider universal conscription, to raise what Prime Minister Gorton would call today “an Israeli-type army” to strike at others.

Although the Fisher Labor and Fusion Governments from 1912 to the beginning of World War I in 1914 authorised 27,749 prosecutions of young men and boys for failure to register and imprisoned no less than 5,732 men and boys for rejecting military training, the chief historian of the anti-conscription struggle, Dr. L. C. Jauncey had to conclude: “One of the features of the enactment of compulsory military training in Australia was the feeble opposition to it.” Socialists, militant trade unionists, Industrial Workers of the World, pacifists, progressive churchmen and Irish-Australians provided the minority opposition.

Lord Kitchener was obviously not interested in defending the Australian mainland: few ever were till the Japanese southward thrust of 1941-42. Kitchener, with sardonic humor, invented the Brisbane Line: 80,000 men were to defend Australia on the Maroochy River just north of Brisbane, and the rest could fight for the Empire on foreign battlefields.

The conscription of youths from the age of 12, with training up to 26 years of age, the Boer War and Boxer expeditions and immigration of British ex-soldiers had provided, by August, 1914, quite a pool of men almost ready to send to defend the Suez Canal, storm the Dardanelles and then bleed in France.

Australia did not have 5 million people till 1918. The volunteer rate, therefore, was fantastic. Over 417,000 men enlisted; 328,639 men and 2,131 women served overseas. Just on 60,000 were killed (nearly as many as for the U.S. forces) and many died from wounds and disease after the war. Over 226,000 men were casualties,
but there were some 320,000 recorded casualties because numbers were wounded again after being sent into action. King George V and others believed in "human wave" attacks on German barbed wire. Under General Gough, the 5th Australian Division suffered 5,500 casualties in a short but suicidal thrust at Fromelles on July 19, 1916. In July, August and September, 1916, Australians were sent time and again into the charnel-house of Pozieres. Losses were so disastrous and Australia had been so bled for manpower that the British knew the only way to get substantial reinforcements was through total conscription.

Further appalling losses in the Ypres offensive of July-August, 1917, preceded the second referendum vote on conscription. The aggregate of deaths and woundings in World War I . . . about 320,000 . . . was not far behind the total of men sent overseas, nearly 329,000.

In World War II casualties were one in six in the forces, and the dead were 33,000, not much more than half the 1914-18 total of nearly 60,000. The First World War distorted Australian economy and trade. Imports were smaller in volume but higher in price. Average annual value of exports in 1914-18 fell by nearly £1 million a year, despite soaring commodity prices on world markets. Ships were scarce and freights astronomical. Consumer demand for factory and farm goods was slowed by diversion of spending power to war loans and war taxes. Imported raw materials and goods grew scarcer and scarcer. Lack of labor, due to heavy volunteering, restricted local output. In 1910 there were 45 million sheep in N.S.W., in 1920 34 million . . . and the loss was by no means all due to drought. Both urban and rural employers were afraid of losing more labor.

Despite the sound material reasons for rejecting any further heavy outflow of labor the referendums for conscription at the end of the years 1916 and 1917 were only defeated by narrow majorities.

The slender majorities leave no room for doubt about the depth of pro-British, pro-Empire sentiment in Australia. On the other hand of course, this makes still more heroic and significant the campaigns and successes of socialists, the I.W.W., many Labor Party and trade union leaders, churchmen, pacifists and the solid force of Australian-Irish affected by the 1916 Easter Rebellion and British oppression in Ireland.

White Australia chauvinism had greatly aided the pro-imperial leaders of Britain and Australia in imposing universal military training on the people before World War 1, and was employed
cynically and hypocritically. The conscription historian Dr. Jauncey says of pre-war propaganda: "To overcome opposition in trade unions advocates of compulsory military training spoke of the "Yellow Peril", both China and Japan being involved in this spectre. Compulsionists told the workers that Japan was only waiting for Britain's entanglement in a European war and then 'Asiatic hordes' would descend on Australia, an assertion happily disproved later in the World War."

But White Australia chauvinism was also used on the anti-conscription side. Dr. Jauncey relates that anti-conscriptionists told rural people that "colored labor" would replace whites on farms. "Vote No and Keep Australia White" met the eye on hoardings throughout the Commonwealth, he says, and "this phase of the conscription issue secured many supporters for the anti-conscriptionists." Henry Boote, usually a principled socialist and an outstanding anti-conscription leader, said: "If we vote to send white workers out of the country, we vote to bring colored workers in."

Australia has passed from the British imperial orientation to the American, and the deep-rooted pro-British sentiments which withstood such dire trials in the 1914-18 war cannot influence conscription for the Vietnam War. The clash of European empires in the Pacific no longer decides Australian military strategy, nor does Japan present an immediate threat. The vast majority of Asians have won national independence.

A screen of British, French, American and Dutch colonial governments and foreign concession-holders and occupiers in China will never again divide Australia from the peoples of Asia, and even our most backward Liberal Party politicians know that Australians cannot withdraw from east of Suez: we must find our future with Asia. And so the White Australia Policy takes on an even more portentous meaning, with its revamped slogans "Better stop them there than here" and "forward defence" on the one hand, and "Fortress Australia" and "White Bastion" concepts on the other.

The future anti-conscription campaign will be fitted to Australia's strategic course, which Canberra's unreconstructed colonialists now try to trace through the mists and marshes of American politics. Washington's greater attention to Europe, disintegrating alliances in the Pacific, its Vietnam crisis, balance of payments problems that will remain intractable while the Pentagon tries to police the world, resistance to US domination abroad and the upsurge of Anglo-Saxon America for new aggressions against 20 million Afro-Americans and the peace movement will exert their press and pull in Australia. The curve and coil of politics in Nixon's
America are unpredictable. Urban Afro-Americans and students have shown that guerilla resistance is not just for the mountains and forests and greater domestic upheavals seem likely under rulers' provocations. Middle East policies are on shifting sands, NATO remains in disarray despite a shot-in-the-arm from the Czechoslovak affair, the East and South-East Asian military alliances are in decomposition and a desperate Nixon calls for Japanese rearmament. The revival of Japanese armed menace to Australia, a major Zaibatsu raw materials base, cannot be dismissed. It could scarcely inspirit Canberra yesmen, and, for the peace movement, would be double-edged in impact.

"More military power for lower cost" is a Pentagon slogan of portent for Australians of call-up age. Client states should pay and provide more, and higher raisings of satellite levies and more reliance on sophisticated weapons and mobile sea and airborne forces could greatly reduce the $4.8 billion yearly drain and the number of US overseas bases. General Robert Wood and State Department Ambassador R. McClintock canvassed these ideas at Canberra talks.

"Fortress Australia" is a logical jumping-off place for giant air troop-carriers and swift ships. Upgrading of North-West Cape communications base, surveys of Western Australian harbors, the mysteries of Pine Gap "Joint Defence Space Research Facility" near Alice Springs and other US establishments in Australia and the R and R descent from Vietnam — getting the indigenes accustomed to the American presence — fall into the pattern. So, perhaps, do Mr. Gorton's advocacy of a mobile "Israeli-type army", which would require far wider conscription, and the State Department-orientated DLP's proposal that Australia should provide "four or five divisions to help South-East Asian governments in event of threats."

US land bases in Australia are conveniently beyond reach of demonstrators and public, in regions holding the minimum of people and maximum of strategic materials, missile and air sites. US naval build-up in the Indian Ocean is proposed — hence NW Cape extensions — and nuclear weaponry is out of sight in its warm expanses. Demonstrators cannot march on Pine Gap as on Aldermaston, or protest at NW Cape as at Sasebo. But conscience can oppose war without excursions into saltbush and sand.

If conscription is extended, as RSL haters of "wogs and bogs" demand, then the potential in the Australian struggle for national independence and peaceful relations with Asia is promising. The Dead Sea fruits of Vietnam intervention have been too ashy for millions to swallow. Non-socialist Asia is less and less willing to
submit to tutelage or join Pentagon-rigged military alliances. “Aid” bribes have been little advance on traditional beads and looking-glasses.

The universities in 1914-18 disgorged imperial chauvinism: their cadet corps quickly furnished the first AIF officers, with one celebrated defection. Australian universities no longer dwell in this mood: change beyond recognition in student and staff attitudes, reflected widely in intellectual life, has dramatically assisted the anti-conscription movement.

Today’s conscription issue has not evoked schism in Labor Party and trade unions as in 1916-17. While much vital energy remains unreleased in the trade unions, wider conscription and interventions would create economic pressures likely to stimulate peace action. Canberra’s apprenticeship for promotion to one-stripe gendarme in SE Asia is not bought in a cheap market: living standards must suffer.

While the Irish have been assimilated and another Dr. Mannix will not emerge to denounce conscription, the cloistral isolation of the Catholic priesthood from the peace movement is being reduced, if only to the extent of tolerance of lay peace activity. The general migrant attitude is among the imponderables: while the generation of displaced persons is politically dubious, it could hardly be assumed that those who voluntarily left Europe for greater security in Australia would be keen to shed blood to bolster the crumbling crusts of empires for which they have no national sympathies. Other imponderables are the corrosions caused by China’s Cultural Revolution and the Czechoslovak invasion.

Australian capitalism in 1916-17 was in its formative era. This engendered some anti-imperial and anti-conscriptionist spirit. Today Australian capitalism is monopolist, but its ranks include many alarmed by massive US, Japanese and other foreign capital incursions, designed to convert the land to a quarry and lift profit take-outs till they undermine national solvency. A pallid nationalism appears now in government ranks; nationalism born of external economic and political pressures and concern over relations with Asian neighbors must grow. But while Canberra’s thinking remains gyved by anti-liberation neurosis and while yes-manship to the chief patron of the petty Asian despots we are supposed to underwrite stalks so unashamedly through Australian policy-making, then certainly all potential allies in the battle for national independence and against conscription for wars of intervention will have to be sought out and welcomed.
Considerable attention is paid in the "Third World" to the theories of Frantz Fanon on how to achieve liberation. These theories are discussed by a research student in Economic History at Strathclyde University in an article which first appeared in Marxism Today.

FANON was born on the island of Martinique in 1925 and experienced at first hand the condition of being a "native," i.e., a colored person, in a colonial society. The exploration and analysis of the personal effects of this condition, formed the subject, somewhat slanted towards Freudian jargon and concepts, of his first book, Black Skin, White Masks, published when he was 27. In France he studied medicine, specialising in psychiatry at the psychiatric hospital at Blida in Algeria.

His experiences there during the revolution, when he was obliged to treat both members of the repressive forces and their victims, and witnessed the diabolical effects of torture on both sides, caused Fanon to become an active participant. He commenced by training Algerian patriots how to control their nervous and physical reactions when engaged in dangerous missions, eventually he served the Provisional Government in a leading diplomatic capacity, particularly in Ghana, where he was able to observe the progress of a colonial revolution very different from the Algerian. In 1961 he was sent to the United States of America mortally sick with leukemia and died in most distressing circumstances, being left helpless and untended in his hotel room by the Americans until practically in his death agonies.

Fanon's two major works are Studies in a Dying Colonialism, 1965 (originally L'An Cinq de la Revolution Algerienne, 1959) and The Wretched of the Earth, 1965 (originally Les Damnés de la Terre, 1961) written shortly afterwards. A collection of pieces on the theme of Towards the African Revolution was published posthumously in 1964.

Revolutionary Nationality and Consciousness

The Studies in a Dying Colonialism might be described as a description and celebration of the creation of a revolutionary nationality and consciousness, and The Wretched of the Earth
as an investigation of the social forces which were to mould the futures of the emerging African states. Both, like all his writings, are highly polemical in tone. Fanon is not a sober controversialist and he prefers to make his points in broad outline illustrated by a striking example or two, rather than build up his case by massive and elaborate accumulations of statistical detail. The dual insight which he gained as a colored person and a trained psychologist is always present, and it can be safely said that nothing else ever written gives an outsider such a vital perception of what it actually feels like to be colonised, despised and regarded as an item of livestock or a feature of the natural environment.

Is the "native lazy, unco-operative and sly, a thief and a liar?" Yes, says Fanon, of course he is, in the absence of political resistance, these are the only weapons he can use to sabotage the colonial machine. Then again, the "native" is described as backward, and not only in the economic sense. He is insanely suspicious of modern technique, especially medicine, he clings obstinately to medieval superstitions and modes of behaviour, he inflicts the most senseless and masochistic rigors on his own person, heedless of the well-intentioned advice purveyed by the occupying powers' welfare services. Perfectly true, agrees Fanon, and proceeds to demonstrate that there is every justification for acting thus.

Such considerations form the subject of Studies in a Dying Colonialism. The Western ethic (despite the latter-day philosophies of pessimism and decadence) values man, science, progress, culture and spiritual development. That is only for home consumption though. There is of course a total divorce between Western values and the colonial facts of the matter. All state power rests in the last resort on violence, but in the colonies this relation assumes a particularly uninhibited and barefaced character. Colonial rule is violence perpetually and systematically practised against the colonised population.

Having robbed the colonised people of their independence, their land and their bread, having removed them from all possibility of science, progress, culture, etc., imperialism is still not satisfied. It seeks to pulverise their indigenous culture, to make them accept their past as a dark barbarism from which conquest has fortunately rescued them, not only to adopt the oppressor's standards but to confess they fall far short of them and that for the foreseeable future their essential nature is and must remain savage and worthless.

It is not to be wondered at that the "natives" refuse to submit to this spiritual rape and prostitution. But what alternative is there? What other source of values can they turn to? The pre-colonial type of existence is broken, meaningless and obsolete,
but it is all they have. The colonised people maintain their dignity as best they can by clinging to the dirty rags of their murdered culture. They emphasise traditions and taboos that have no significance in modern conditions, obscurantist superstitions take on a new lease of life. There is a violent refusal of the oppressors' science and knowledge even when these would be objectively beneficial. The colonialists, according to temperament, wax indignant at the colossal difficulty of teaching these savages anything or else smile indulgently at the quaint folklore.

And so we discover the typical stereotype of the colonial society, primitive, stagnant, unchanging, a race whose only possible use to science or human advancement is to serve as the raw material for anthropological studies.

**Man Changes Himself**

The theme of the *Studies* is the process by which in changing the world — in this case by revolutionary war — man changes himself. Fanon shows how the Algerian nationality was forged by the demands of the struggle and how the people discovered a capability for the most advanced forms of organisation and developed the ability to use the most up-to-date techniques — and without any assistance at that — when to do so ceased to be a sign of surrender to the alien ethic and became instead a necessary requirement for prosecuting the war. Knowledge and applied science are never accepted simply on their merits, but judged by the company they keep.

Fanon shows this process occurring in four major areas of Algerian society; the treatment of women, family life, communications and medicine. He traces the process by which the Algerians discarded the old protective prejudices and adopted for their own use the devices they had formerly rejected because of their association with the foreign oppressor. The ancient obscurantist values, artificially preserved in the hermetically sealed environment of colonial society, crumble away. A new ethic and a morality is born, one in which national liberation and the revolution become the supreme goals. The natives recover their dignity and intellect. A new man emerges.

From the colonisers' point of view one of the most scandalous of the traditional Algerian practices was the custom of veiling and secluding their women folk. The absence of the veil was a badge proclaiming the acceptance of alien standards, and hence the "liberation of Algerian woman" took its place among the foremost battle cries of the Foreign Legion parachutists and the "Algerie Francaise" pieds noirs. Eventually the unveiling was accomplished.
by the Algerians themselves in the interests of revolutionary effectiveness. The use of women for revolutionary work of one sort or another in the European quarters of the cities, the presence of female soldiers in the Marquis, made its existence totally redundant. Eventually it was worn or left off according to the exigencies of the situation or the needs of disguise. It had lost its sacred character altogether, and, correspondingly, the position of women in colonial society had been profoundly transformed in a progressive and liberating direction.

Likewise, with family relationships in general. The authoritarian, ritualized patterns and behaviour dissolved when patriotism and the necessities of the revolution rather than patriarchal respect and obedience became the primary consideration of young Algerian men and women, when husbands and wives were separated for long periods and the women left to shift for themselves or, as frequently happened, suffered outrage and torture for the sake of the national cause, when millions were uprooted from their ancestral habitations and herded into concentration camps. Entirely new conceptions of marriage and sexual roles came into existence, based on equality and respect for shared revolutionary endeavour.

Before the outbreak of the revolution in November 1954, few Algerians cared to possess a radio. The official station, "Radio Alger", was the voice of the occupying power, and its programs, which were in the habit of regularly glorifying the episodes of the European conquest and domination, provided an important cultural cement for the scattered settler population. Algerians remained indifferent.

With the commencement of the armed struggle a burning need was manifest to link the entire people to the movement and provide a country wide news service on the revolutionary progress. This was all the more urgent as the colons largely succeeded in suppressing the democratic press in Algeria. The FLN thereupon established its own broadcasting station, "The Voice of Algeria," and Algerian attitudes to the radio were transformed. Listening to the "Voice" and combating the French jamming became an intense, communal, patriotic activity and incredible risks were run to possess a set.

In the forefront of the colonialist's philanthropic self-image and serving as one of the cardinal justifications for his regime, stood his medical services. As indicated, the Algerian attitude was somewhat different. By and large the subject population refused to be treated, and on the rare occasions its members consented to it they did so in the most lackadaisical and reluctant fashion. Not too surprising, when it is remembered that the doctor appeared
invariably in the guise of an over-lord, usually arrogant and contemptuous, behaving generally like a vet rather than a physician, often being a landlord or other form of direct exploiter into the bargain. Suspicion prevailed that deaths in hospitals were not invariably due to natural causes, and the less agreeable aspects of treatment were often looked upon as simply another variety of European sadism.

Then the time arrived when medical supplies, next to munitions, were the key to victory. Once more the popular outlook changed dramatically. Desperate courage was employed to procure them against impossible odds. The people enthusiastically directed their attention towards acquiring skill at hygiene and first-aid, and went on to master the most elaborate procedures required to establish a nation-wide medical service.

A concluding section of the book deals with a different theme, the passing over of considerable numbers of the European population to service in the revolutionary struggle. It details the invaluable assistance received by the FLN from the most unlikely quarters among the Europeans — the students, the Jewish community, even police officers, and an astonishingly large number of the rural settlers themselves. The political maturity of the FLN at this period is demonstrated by the fact that it could win and use such people, and proves a salutary reminder that, in contrast to what Stokely Carmichael and certain others may assert, any individual, no matter what his class origins may be, can join up with the oppressed class and participate in their struggle. These people, too, became Algerians.

So out of the blood and the fire a new people is forged and the nation is born. *Studies in a Dying Colonialism* does not go beyond this point. It does not inspect the fate of the nation after it emerges from the colonial situation.

*Parties and Politicians*

*The Wretched of the Earth* takes up from there, and is broader both in political and geographical scope. After a brief initial consideration of the debasement which colonial rule works on native culture and psychology, exemplified in such phenomena as intertribal vendettas, animism, etc., Fanon directs his attention to the political trends in the emerging African nations which he sees as most significant for their future. Basically the work might be called a critique of the nationalist parties which evolved during the course of the independence struggle and which usually ended by taking over as the successors to the colonial power, almost universally on a negotiated basis and without open warfare.
Fanon is particularly concerned with what he claims to be the fact that these parties and the politicians who lead them are nearly always based on and draw their strength from the towns and do not relate in a meaningful fashion to the rural masses. This factor is one major weakness, and alongside it the parties have certain other highly undesirable characteristics. In the minds of the leaders, it is alleged, politics appears primarily as a dialogue with the colonial authorities at the seat of power, with the object of winning a series of concessions within the framework tolerated by the colonialists which lead to a negotiated independence at the end of the road, with black faces substituted for white in the government apparatus, but no other significant changes. In other words these leaders are mainly interested in power and privilege for themselves and their main quarrel with the colonial regime is that it fails to give them a satisfactory share of the booty wrung from the people at large.

These leaders are in fact frauds. They organise the militancy of the masses, at least the urban masses, but they look upon it as their private property, to be turned on or off like a tap, at suitable points in the process of negotiation with the imperial state. They have no intention of conceding any real say in affairs to their followers. They are full of distrust for the countryside, regard it as tribal, chief-ridden, backward and reactionary, believe (on the whole correctly) that in the countryside the colonialists find such popular support as they can count on. When they do give the peasants their attention they try to batter down the obscurantist traditions instead of using them to develop the struggle and in the process weaning the people away from them.

The last thing they try to do is prepare or organise the people for armed struggle, yet frequently they are taken by surprise when it breaks out nevertheless. In that case the town-based nationalist politicians attempt to use the revolt without identifying with it. Perhaps the colonialists throw them into jail all the same, but often enough they hasten to bargain, even to decolonise, before the situation gets entirely out of hand. In which event the nationalist party may even find itself as the government taking over and prosecuting the same repressive anti-popular war as the imperial power was engaged in before the change-over.

More often, however, what has happened is that the nationalist party achieved its objects without such a distressing eventuality. A new state came into being amid popular rejoicing with its flag, parliament, seat in UNO and all the trappings of national sovereignty.

The bright new image is soon tarnished, however, mutual suspicion remains between the town and the countryside, a great divide
separates the governors from the governed, the former in fact are closer in attitude and temperament to the previous masters than to their own subjects.

"Model" of Betrayal

Soon the state is divided, not merely between the new exploiters and those patriots who have the people's true interests at heart and have generally been excluded from office and power, but also between different factions of the ruling group itself, the "ins" who monopolise the sweets of office and the "outs" who desire to lay hold of them. Both these factions try to provide themselves with a political base, and since their aims are careerist and corrupt and so win no popular support, they turn to bargain with the most regressive elements in the rural districts. If the "outs" are making the running in this game we get parties based on chiefs, money lenders and rich peasants, demanding regional autonomy and tribal independence, endeavouring to circumvent and nullify the central government's power over them. If the "ins" are working the trick, tribal obscurantism is mobilised against revolutionary opponents.

In any event the unity of the nation is disrupted, corruption and cynicism reign in the government, tribalism, superstition and rural idiocy renew their vigor while imperialism comes back triumphant in the shape of neo-colonialism. The entire process of liberation goes into reverse.

This is Fanon's model of how revolutionary hopes are betrayed. While he proceeds to provide an explanation he is quite emphatic that the problem has its roots in the class basis of the nationalist parties, from the fact that they are primarily the creations of the colonial bourgeoisie and its intellectual collaborators.

Colonial Bourgeoisie

In the first place they win popular support by a range of anti-imperialist and even socialist-sounding slogans, but the leaders seldom take these slogans seriously, and hasten to exclude from their parties any persons or groups who actually do so. Nevertheless for a period the interests of the bourgeoisie — expulsion of the occupier — do coincide with the general interest and on this basis independence is won.

But these bourgeoisie have no future, because unlike their European counterparts 150 years ago they are not inventive, industrial and dynamic. They are, on the contrary, weak and corrupt, with an entirely parasitic role. In a world economy tightly sewn up by imperialist monopolies, and ruling pauperised and fragmented states, they cannot develop as a class by emulating the Japanese
and developing a powerful national capitalism. All they can do is exploit the economic channels previously established by imperialism and function as middle-men and Western business agents in the neo-colonial exploitation of the nation. Even when they go in for Africanisation it is not on a progressive basis but merely to secure a monopolistic grip on the national resources and the middleman role. The upshot of their practice is in the long run usually to exploit the people as intensely as the former masters, without even the excuse of developing the national economy by doing so:

Using two or three slogans these new colonists will demand an enormous amount of work from the agricultural labourers, in the name of the national effort of course. (p.124).

It is readily understandable that under pressure of these developments the national consciousness and the national party both go to pieces. Taking their cue from the elite, the labor classes in the towns betray chauvinistic attitudes towards “immigrants” — economic competitors from foreign African states:

If Europeans get in the way of the intellectuals and business bourgeoisie . . . for the mass of the people in the towns competition is represented principally by Africans of another nation . . . (p.126).

Regional and tribal exclusiveness flourish and often religious diversion exacerbates the process further. Nigeria is a tragic example of this process. Completely incapable of preserving even national unity, the African bourgeoisie is far less able to create the continental unity to which they pay pious tribute.

**Disintegration of Party**

Naturally the party disintegrates as well, degenerating into what is at best an arthritic administrative machine and at worst a gangster protection racket. No longer does it express the people’s will to any extent at all, it is reduced to serving the state as an instrument of administrative discipline and pronouncement:

The party helps the government to hold the people down. It becomes more and more clearly anti-democratic, an implement of coercion. (p.138).

Even in this shabby task it is not given first place, for lacking the self-confident sophistication and skill of the Western bourgeoisie, the African one rules increasingly by demagogy and the leadership principle, combined with spectacular demonstrations of force, and the governing caste sinks deeper into insolence, corruption and arbitrariness. As the popular masses become more and more alienated from the regime, the leader, an heroic figure from the past is brought forward as a national mascot to confuse and distract the people:

The leader, who has behind him a lifetime of political action and devoted patriotism, constitutes a screen between the people and the rapacious bourgeoisie
since he stands surety for the ventures of that caste and closes his eyes to their insolence, their mediocrity and their fundamental immorality. He comes to the aid of the bourgeois caste and hides its manoeuvres from the people... Every time he speaks... he calls to mind his often heroic life, the struggles he has led... and the victories... he has achieved, thereby intimating clearly to the masses that they ought to go on putting their trust in him... These men who... have taken upon themselves the whole burden of the past... find themselves today, alas, at the head of a team of administrators who... proclaim that the vocation of their people is obey, to go on obeying and to be obedient to the end of time. (p.135).

As the history of the past few years demonstrates however, such gambits fail to save the elite. Incapable of governing on its own merits it depends to an ever-growing degree on the military and police forces and is eventually shoved aside by them.

Fanon has no hesitation in asserting that the only alternative to one version or another of this depressing scenario is for genuinely committed leaders to involve the people deeply in national planning at all levels, to cut free from colonial economic ties and to develop the party as a real expression of the people's will, being careful to keep the best party militants separate from administrative functions. The masses must be politically educated and consciously involved and the only way to prevent the army developing Bonapartist longings is to politicise it, to create correct political understanding among the soldiers. Nationalism is a blind alley unless an effective social and economic program is developed beyond the patriotic slogans. Fanon maintains categorically that the only real lines along which a newly liberated country can advance are socialist ones, and though he does not use the phrase he makes it quite clear that he means scientific socialism.

Points of Criticism

Such is the case presented by Frantz Fanon and it would be idle to deny that events since his death have borne out his analysis to a remarkable degree. Even so, there are points upon which marxists, while conceding the great strength of his arguments, might wish to voice dissent.

In the first place it is difficult to avoid the impression that in discussing the preconditions for colonial revolution he gives insufficient weight to circumstances which remain beyond the control of the revolutionaries. It might be assumed on the basis of Fanon's analysis that the only condition necessary to begin the struggle is the cultivation of an appropriate attitude of mind among the people. This rather one-sided emphasis and tendency towards political voluntarism, the suggestion almost that the strength of a revolutionary cause is essentially "in the mind" could be seriously misleading if it caused revolutionaries to ignore objective conditions and convince themselves that the imperialist
power was bound to succumb at any time to a sufficiently determined attack. However it is most unlikely that the Algerian revolution could have succeeded twenty years earlier, or that successful revolt will be possible in South Africa until the regime's strength is undermined by its own short-sightedness and more adequate international mobilisation against it.

In regard to international factors although Fanon pays tribute to the assistance rendered by the socialist camp to the colonial revolution, his work appears to lack an appreciation of the fact that it has only been made possible in the first place by the disruption and chaos created in the world imperialist system by the appearance, existence and advance of the socialist states, which have been the indispensable pivot for the anti-imperialist revolutions of the twentieth century. Even more, Fanon ignores or dismisses the contributions made by the organised working class in the metropolitan countries, maintaining that all strata of imperialist society have a share in colonial exploitation and that bribery from colonial plunder has hopelessly corrupted them. He values what help they may give to the colonial revolution but does not think it can ever amount to much.

It would be a distortion to imply that Fanon is entirely blind to the necessarily inter-linked nature of the struggle carried out by the socialist states, the working class in imperialist countries and the national liberation movement, but the notice he gives it is pretty perfunctory. There are elements of a narrow "Third Worldism" in his outlook.

Role of Violence

The aspect of Fanon's writings which has undoubtedly excited the most guilty and disapproving fascination on the part of academic commentators is the alleged emphasis on violence and the value of violence against the aggressor as a therapeutic activity in restoring the native's morale and self-respect. The attitude of such people to the colonial situation is, "we support your claims for a better deal of course, but don't get violent or we'll have to disapprove of you." Violence is looked upon by these people as a metaphysical abstraction of evil.

Since bourgeois society legitimises itself on the basis of free agreements and social contract those who are intellectually imprisoned in its ideology cannot bear to know that all class rule is a form of violence and that a movement which renounces its use under all circumstances, far from abolishing it, is merely sanctifying the infliction of one-sided violence by the ruling class. Fanon never lets them forget that the violence is there already and the only question at issue is its direction.
All the same he would seem to go beyond this to argue that the only genuine method of liberation is revolutionary war, and that negotiated political settlements with the colonial power are inevitable betrayals which entrench the middle class in power and lead on to counter-revolution. Although in many cases this claim has been justified by the event it has not, nevertheless, been invariably so. Guinea at least is managing to proceed along this road towards a socialist order of society and in Ghana, for all its weakness the Nkrumah government was by no means entirely discredited or politically bankrupt. Conversely, Algeria, the prime example in Africa of liberation by revolutionary war did not escape a military coup. Nor does it appear to be impossible, though admittedly very difficult and rare, for a party orginally led by middle-class elements to transform itself into a genuinely popular movement carrying through the transformation of the economy and social life that all socialists regard as necessary. Julius Nyerere’s TANU is arguably an example of this.

There is evidence for two things. Firstly that something more than revolutionary war is necessary to give a socialist orientation to emerging nations, and secondly that such war may not be essential.

Role of the Working Class

What has to be considered here is surely the role of the working class in the liberation movement and the new nation. Fanon has a very low opinion of its revolutionary capacities, believing that its relatively privileged position vis-a-vis the peasantry and the lumpen-proletariat will keep it quiescent, or at any rate, if independence is to eventuate in socialism, it must be the peasantry and rural proletariat, the most dispossessed class, which assumes the leadership, with the town proletariat playing a subordinate political role. He is very adamant on this point.

It would be arrogant and dogmatic simply to say “Fanon is entirely mistaken on this, his argument is entirely un-marxist,” but it may certainly be noted that his description of the colonial working class as the social stratum which is “most pampered” by the imperialists is wildly inaccurate. Relatively well off they may be in some cases (though not always) compared to the absolute destitution in the countryside, but the “most pampered” sections are certainly the immediate tools of the colonial power, soldiers, police, state functionaries and the like together with the trading and mercantile sections most closely involved with the imperialist economy.

In any event, has it not always been the case that in nations where socialist revolution has occurred the situation was essentially
similar, and that the working class assumed the leadership because it was the most politically advanced and the best organised section of the exploited people, circumstances which often go along with being the most privileged.

Russia in 1917 is far from being an exact parallel with, say, Senegal, in 1968, but the similarities are probably more significant than the differences. Again in Cuba, the revolution's military victory was won in the countryside but its socialist direction was only definitely established once it had also gained the towns and could employ the political experience of the urban working class.

Fanon's conception in this matter must be compared with that of Lenin. With his profound understanding of the absolutely critical importance of the peasantry to the socialist revolution in underdeveloped countries, Lenin made the keynote of his strategy the link and alliance between proletariat and peasants, with the proletariat always providing the revolutionary initiative and political leadership. It is not any special metaphysical virtue of the proletariat which makes this arrangement necessary, merely the fact that it is this class which handles the sector of the economy and the mode of production which is of over-mastering importance in the life and development of modern communities and ones which are striving to modernise. It is the working class which has its hands on the levers of the future.

**Passionate Involvement**

However, if these are weaknesses in Fanon, they are the weaknesses of his strength, which rests in his passionate involvement with "the wretched of the earth," the "criminals of want" and a blazing concern for their dignity and human demands. He remains one of the major political theorists of the twentieth century. For Western man his words are salutary. For anyone who reads Fanon with sympathy none of the imperialist myths — the civilising mission, the native's backwardness — can ever again command the slightest flicker of acceptance.

The utter corruption of every human action and relation in the colonial atmosphere is exposed brilliantly. For the peoples of the dispossessed nations not only in Africa, but in Asia and Latin America too, he was at once an unqualified partisan and at the same time a harsh critic of their shortcomings and of pseudo-revolutionary waffle. At a time like the present, when the colonial revolution is meeting phenomenal difficulties yet still surging irresistibly forward, the mature understanding and commentary which he would have drawn from his mature understanding of it would have been invaluable. It is an immense tragedy he did not survive to continue his work.
HO CHI MINH, by Jean Lacouture, Allen Lane. The Penguin Press. $5.25.

THE DECISION of President Johnson to call a halt to the US bombing of North Vietnam has already set many people asking "Why?" Statements from military and political leaders in America and South Vietnam have assured us that the war in Vietnam is being won by the Allies. Why then, at this moment, should a halt be called?

No one can understand this situation without attempting some study of the history of the Vietnamese nation and Ho Chi Minh, the man who leads it in the north, and who commands the love and respect of millions in the south as well. What kind of man is he? Why can't the Americans find anything worse to call him than a Communist boss? Why couldn't the French, who hated him bitterly, ever find him guilty of anything but political crimes? What are his aims? Jean Lacouture, who spent much time in Vietnam, has interviewed Ho Chi Minh himself many times and had access to French records of the colonial and post-colonial periods, provides many of the answers, in this full scale biography.

President Ho's charisma is such that everyone feels it. Lacouture is an experienced and sophisticated journalist. His book is a fine lesson in objective writing, but read his description of his first meeting with Ho. "... I was steeped in the legend of the man, trying to read every word that had been written about him ... But even without these special circumstances I would have been fascinated by the figure who had just come into the room ... The first thing that struck me, apart from this unlooked for air of benignity, was the extraordinary glow in the eyes beneath his bushy brows, huge forehead and tuft of grey hair ... The expression in those remarkable eyes would have invited the word "ingenuous", except that I knew things about him which precluded any possibility that ingenuousness might be among his attributes . . .

When he asked me to have a cup of tea, or drew up a chair for me, or offered me a cigarette, it was as though he were making apologies for living among the trappings of a colonial governor. Since then, people have assured me this awkwardness was an act . . . But can mere artifice really have produced that engaging manner and that extraordinary gift for making contact, a gift which at once engendered a warm and direct exchange of views and gave a startlingly fresh ring to commonplace words?"

I myself felt this extraordinary charm and freshness, coupled with remarkable informality, on the many occasions when I met President Ho Chi Minh during my three years in Hanoi, from 1958 on. The British lawyer, Loseby who defended him tirelessly when he was arrested in Hong Kong, and who returned to visit him as President of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in 1960, fifteen years later, and Sir Stafford Cripps, later to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, who argued his case before the British Cabinet, were not proof against it. Vo Nguyen Giap, who met him for the first time in 1940 and has remained his close comrade-in-arms and politics ever since, describes this meeting. "I found myself confronted by a man of shining simplicity. This was the first time I had set eyes on him, yet already we were conscious of deep bonds of friendship."
Lacouture's book traces the development of Ho Chi Minh, from the time he was a tiny boy, named Cung, through his various aliases of Nguyet Tat Thanh, Ba, Nguyen Ai Quoc, Vuong, and Lin, to the final Ho Chi Minh — He who Enlightens.

He investigates with care and objectivity and yet always one feels that his sympathy is held. Is Uncle Ho first a patriot and then a revolutionary, as many have claimed? My own feeling is that he himself would see these as two sides of the one coin. He is certainly a brave man, surviving out of "sheer stubborness", long periods in prison and hospital with his ever recurring tuberculosis.

At least twice, his terms of imprisonment and brutal treatment, coupled with tuberculosis, have led to reports of his death. How he didn’t die is a miracle, and when in a coma deep in the jungle, Vo Nguyen Giap reports that with what he and everyone else thought were Ho’s dying breaths he was outlining the course of the revolution for the immediate future.

Ho is also a poet, writing in sharp, Chinese characters, verse that appeals by its humanist quality even in translation. His verses contained in the volume known as Prison Diary, reveal many facets of his human qualities, the humor, compassion, tenderness and at times sharpness. The English-language edition has been beautifully written by the Australian poet Aileen Palmer, working painstakingly from a word-by-word translation from the Vietnamese.

So Ho Chi Minh is revealed by Lacouture as a patriot, a revolutionary, a poet, a man of courage, but also a skilled publicist, a liberator, a negotiator of extraordinary patience and wit, and a brilliant resistance leader.

Lacouture also spends a lot of time on what is probably the outstanding characteristic of Ho Chi Minh, his capacity to inspire love and affection. Throughout South-East Asia he is referred to almost universally as Bac Ho — Uncle Ho — and this is really meaningful. As Lacouture explains, there are two Vietnamese words constantly used when Ho Chi Minh’s name crops up in Vietnam — they are nghia, and hieu.

Nghia is close to the idea contained in "duty" and the nghia binding Ho to the Vietnamese people is the consciousness of a two-way obligation, of devotedness on the one side and loyalty and discipline on the other. Add to this hieu, filial piety, and you get something like the extraordinary bond of love that is felt by the people and by Ho himself. As Lacouture says, no other leader in the world today is viewed by his followers as being both inventor and protector, source and guide, theory and practice, nation and revolution, yogi and commissar, goodnatured uncle and great war-leader.

The growth of the man and his stature is accurately traced and documented. His development and behavior as a leader are reported with the keen eyes of the French political journalist, whose country has a unique background in Vietnam among European nations.

But Ho’s attitude to America and America’s position in Vietnam is also carefully defined and anyone who still is foolish enough to believe that the Americans have been in Vietnam for freedom’s sake, should carefully read page 227 and think for a second time.

Lacouture, by no means a communist, and a man who must have done an enormous amount of research in his work as a journalist and the writing of his earlier book Le Vietnam entre deux paix, as well as in this book in which Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh are almost inseparable, finds
it in his heart to finish in this way:
"Uncle Ho is an old man now, and
tired after so many years of fighting in
the revolutionary cause. But even if . . . he does not live to see Viet­
nam reunified and independent, all
the way from the China border to
Cape Camau, others — deputies whom
he has moulded for no other purpose,
and who have fought hard themselves —
will live to see it for him."

Who knows, perhaps President
Johnston’s advisers, on the matter
of stopping the bombing, may have
either read this book or taken a long,
level look at the facts which led to
its writing.

LORRAINE SALMON

MONOPOLY CAPITAL, by
Baran and Sweezy. Pelican

THE PUBLICATION in Australia of
a new and cheap edition of Monopoly
Capital raises three important ques­
tions for Marxists: (a) how valid is the
analysis? (b) how does it fit in with
other contemporary radical analysis of
modern capitalism (such as Galbraith’s
The Modern Industrial State)? (c) how
far do its basic conclusions apply to
Australia?

Central to the book is the demonstra­
tion that because of pricing policies
within the modern capitalist corpo­
arion, modern capitalism is characterised
by a tendency for “economic surplus”
(defined as the difference between what
a society produces and the costs incur­
red in producing it) to rise in both
absolute and relative terms. The
authors say: “This law immedi­
ately invites comparison, as it
should, with the classical Marxian
law of the falling tendency of the rate
of profit. Without entering into an
analysis of the different versions of the
latter, we can say that they all pre­
suppose a competitive system. By sub­
stituting the law of rising surplus for
the law of falling profit we are not re­
jecting or revising a time-honoured
theorem of political economy: we are
simply taking account of the un­
doubted fact that the structure of the
capitalist economy has undergone a
fundamental change since that theorem
was formulated. What is most essential
about the change from competitive to
monopoly capitalism finds its theoreti­
cal expression in this substitution.”

Here the authors claim too much
about bringing the (implied) obsolete
analysis of Karl Marx up to date. Take
the absolute rise in surplus. In Volume
3 of Capital, Marx argues that as the
process of production and capital ac­
cumulation proceeds, the mass of sur­
plus value that can be and is approp­
riated must grow, and so must also
grow the absolute mass of profits accu­
mulated by the capitalist class. The
decline in the rate of profit itself leads
to a rise in the mass of profits and
in the mass of surplus. This is because
the huge amounts of capital locked up
in investment, while they tend to real­
ise a smaller rate of profit, swell the
volume of total profits.

Moreover Capital is not confined to
an analysis of competitive capitalism.
Marx also thought he discerned a long
term trend to increased concentration
and centralisation of capital, rapid
elimination of small and medium­
sized enterprises and a tendency for
exploitation to increasingly take the
form of more “relative” surplus value
through higher productivity from more
machinery per worker (rather than
from more “absolute” surplus value
from longer hours and wage freeze).
This is surely an early sketch of a
“model” of monopolistic capitalism.

Granted that there is a dominant
tendency towards rising surplus, the
major contradiction faced by the sys­
tem is the absorption and distribution
of the growing surplus. This problem
enables Baran and Sweezy to introduce
a splendid discussion of the role played
by the economic activities of the State, the role of advertising and the drive to war preparation in promoting wasteful "outlets". Military spending and capital export though, are partly self-defeating, since the former increases the profit rate and capital exports produce a return flow of profits and interest.

Much of the technical side of the analysis depends, quite rightly, on the degree of monopoly. But while the authors show how this affects the distribution of surplus among industries, they do not discuss in detail the mechanism by which it influences the level of aggregate surplus. In this respect, the price and profit policies of large corporations are not a sufficient explanation, as many sectors of the economy do not operate on this basis.

Galbraith's analysis is close to Baran and Sweezy in stressing the central role of oligopoly and the "techno-structure" which operates it, as well as the formal link between large corporation and the state. Galbraith also stresses the irrationalities of American capitalism. However, he pays less attention to "realisation" problems and more to management problems: the role of bureaucracy, planning by the capitalist state etc.

Applying Baran and Sweezy to Australian conditions we can note deviations from their "monopoly capital" model (which is after all, the result of a close study of the base and superstructure of American society). Deviations arise from the tradition of Australian vested interest group organisations operating on a number of central economic command posts and ad hoc regulatory agencies. True, the sort of formal integration of big business and government detected by Baran-Sweezy and Galbraith is now growing up side by side with this system. But the older system still persists.

Australia is still an open economy, more influenced by world trade than in the USA. It is still in an extensive phase of development — it remains largely a frontier economy. While the manufacturing sector is highly monopolistic, other sectors (rural industry, tertiary industry, services) are not. "Surplus" is probably rising only in manufacturing. Moreover, Australia has a clever public service with more power and independence from its political masters than in the USA. They are sure to introduce certain piecemeal reforms to counter the trends mentioned by Baran and Sweezy: advertisement taxes, consumers' research and discriminatory taxation to curb profit retention. Such things are not politically possible in America because of the greater power and fanatical adherence to laissez faire policies of big business. In Australia they are politically possible: indeed the role of the Australian Labor Party as one pillar of the system would definitely be to introduce them.

B. McFarlane


MEANJIN commenced publication in December 1940 as Meanjin Papers: Contemporary Queensland Verse — a slim eight page pamphlet devoted entirely to poetry. Clearly its editor, Clem Christesen, had no idea of the success which would attend his venture, nor indeed of exactly what that venture was. In the first issue he wrote that Meanjin would print prose as well as verse, even though he saw its main duty as being to "talk poetry". He wrote: "It is hoped to continue publication of this brochure throughout the war period — and perhaps well into the Peace."
But the early search for an identity for *Meanjin* can be seen from the fact that with the second number the subtitle became *Contemporary Queensland Prose and Verse* and with the third number *Contemporary Queensland Letters*, whereas the fourth number saw a reversion to the subtitle of the second.

By 1945, however, *Meanjin* had moved to Melbourne and was bearing the imprint of the University Press, was eighty pages long and carried four pages of plates each quarter. It claimed a circulation of four thousand. It was now subtitled *A Quarterly of Literature* and included a wide range of contributions, both from Australia and overseas. The more distinctive *Meanjin*, the *Meanjin* we know today, had begun to take shape.

Even so, as one looks back through the files of the first two volumes (the first sixteen numbers) one of the most striking things is the way in which *Meanjin*, operating under war-time conditions, and being published in very limited numbers, was able to build up a list of contributors who were, or who have since become, national or well-known figures. They included: Kate Baker, Manning Clark, Miles Franklin, H. M. Green, A. D. Hope, Vance and Nettie Palmer, R. D. Fitzgerald, Kylie Tennant, Judith Wright and James McAuley. An impressive list by the standards of any Australian journal; for one published in war-time Brisbane, little short of phenomenal.

Now, twenty-odd years later, and still under the editorship of Christensen, *Meanjin* has produced this anthology of writings which appeared in it during its first twenty five years. Or at least, an anthology of the work of Australian writers for *Meanjin*. The distinction is worth making because, far more than any other Australian quarterly, *Meanjin* has established contact with major overseas writers, and one of the chief reasons why it occupies such an important position in the field of Australian culture is simply that its consistent effort to escape parochialism has enabled it to speak with a voice of sophistication and authority unparalleled in our literary history, and approached perhaps only by *Overland*. Overseas writers who have written for *Meanjin* include Ezra Pound, Sean O'Casey, Jean-Paul Sartre, Dylan Thomas and C. P. Snow. As well, a whole number (3/1963) was devoted to recent French writing.

But of course it is primarily as *A Review of Arts and Letters in Australia* (the present subtitle) that *Meanjin* has become famous, and it is this aspect of the journal which this book represents so adequately. None of the material in it of course is new — some of it, in fact, appeared nearly thirty years ago. And yet, reading through the book, it's almost impossible to seize upon anything that does not seem worthy of reprinting. Indeed, one of the most striking things about the book is the way in which it confirms, even within the confines of a few hundred pages, what one has often thought: that the influence of *Meanjin* on Australian letters and culture over the past quarter-century has been profound, and on a far more serious level than the influence exerted by that other major journal in Australian history, the *Bulletin* of the 1880's and 90's.

Seminal articles, or articles by writers of seminal importance, have abounded in *Meanjin*, and several of them appear in this anthology. Rex Ingamells' "Australian Outlook" (8/1942), for instance, where the leader of the Jindyworobak movement spoke out against the Australian tendency to "embrace a sickly, irrelevant nostalgia for English Society and Hollywood notoriety"; or A. A. Phillips' now famous "The Cultural Cringe" (4/1950), an article which seems to lie...
close to the heart of Meanjin and the values for which it has stood. David Martin’s article on Judah Waten, Frank Hardy and John Morrison, “Three Realists in Search of Reality” (3/1959) was another to break entirely new ground, and R. D. Fitzgerald’s “Mary Gilmore: Poet and Great Australian” (4/1960) is an essay of great interest and importance: a tribute from one major poet to another.

Through articles of this quality (and they have been many) Meanjin, whilst it has been forging its own identity, has done more than any other contemporary journal to help forge an Australian identity as well.

One could go on to list further the articles, stories, poems and sketches included in this volume from A. D. Hope’s still very funny review (“Confessions of a Zombie”) of a youthful novel by Max Harris (1/1944), to the stories of Vance Palmer, Patrick White, Peter Cowan, Alan Marshall and Judah Waten, and the poems of Hope, Douglas Stewart, Gwen Harwood and Judith Wright (who can probably be regarded as Meanjin’s great literary “discovery” during the period). These are but a fraction of the book’s offerings.

It would be a mistake though to feel that the book could in some way supersede our files of back copies of Meanjin, for clearly there are many things which just couldn’t be included. The various “causes” with which Meanjin has been associated over the years, for instance. One will still have to go to the files for issue by issue accounts of Meanjin and the Elizabethan Theatre Trust, or the academic recognition of Australian literature, or the Power Bequest. And it’s a pity that space couldn’t have been found for a few more articles: for example, Norman Bartlett’s “The Necessity of the Little Magazine: The Australian Scene” (2/1948), a pioneering article of great interest, and still not superseded by John Tregenza’s recent book, Australian Little Magazines. I was surprised too not to see Brian Fitzpatrick’s “Counter-revolution in Australian Historiography?” (2/1963) included. But the biggest omission of all, and one which seems impossible to understand, is that of Jack Lindsay, who has been one of the most consistent and important of Meanjin contributors over many years. Surely he counts as an Australian!

Leon Cantrell

**QUOTATIONS FROM CHAIRMAN LBJ, by Wren & Shepherd. Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 189 p.p. $2.50.**

I just knew in my heart that it was not right for Dick Nixon to ever be President of this country. (LBJ, October 1964)

This is just one of the gems from the very latest in little red books — a record of the more memorable quotations from the speeches, musings and digressions of Lyndon Baines Johnson. It is indeed a fitting tribute to the LBJ empire now in the last stages of its demise. Pocket-sized and sturdily bound in red cloth (no cheap Chinese plastics for Lyndon, thanks!) it contains over 500 of Lyndon’s sayings.

The date and source of each is given but no attempt has been made to rework the heroic thoughts into grammatical English. Translators, Wren & Shepherd, have merely arranged them under such helpful headings as Messianic Infallibility, Heroic Exhortations, Let a Hundred Flowers Flourish, White Man’s Burden, etc.

The book cannot fail to amuse as from first (‘Don’t spit in the soup. We’ve all got to eat’) to last (I’m the only President you’ve got) it fairly bristles with the ultimate in Johnsonian inanities, trivia and social
gaffes. For this reason alone it is a good investment.

Of more importance, however, is the clear insight it gives into the complete hypocrisy of the man who portrays himself as a liberal, a champion of civil rights legislation and a peacemaker. Thanks to the painstaking research of Wren & Shepherd, Johnson stands condemned by his own words as a bigot, a cynical militarist, a man of little perception and even less compassion.

Have you ever wondered what Johnson really thought about negroes, peace, Vietnam and the host of other matters about which he frequently mouths such tired cliches? Quotations from Chairman LBJ makes it alarmingly clear. It is a telling indictment no less of Johnson himself than of his society.

PATRICIA HEALY


THIS BOOK by the master Soviet spy and arch-traitor to the Anglo-American Establishment, Kim Philby, leaves enough questions unanswered to justify the hope that it is not his last book on the subject.

No Englishman has written so frankly and contemporaneously about the obscurely fascinating intelligence net-work of British imperialism; no one has been more crushing with an inside view of its doomed elite. Yet there is enough of the English Establishment left in Philby himself to lend zeal to his outline of the conflicts between American and British intelligence services, whose marriage in the war-time 1940’s "doomed the British services, in the long run, to junior status."

Philby played an important part in the inner-service political intrigue which required British cultivation of the CIA and hoodwinking of the FBI of Hoover, whom he describes as a man with "a bubble reputation" in counter-espionage, but a great politician who has put his vast dossier file on Americans to effective use in defending his "totalitarian empire." The Anglo-American intelligence conflict emerges sharply when Philby lifts the lid on ill-fated attempts to land a force in Albania to prepare for an invasion and counter-revolution and also to drop subversion agents into the Soviet Ukraine. Both were complete failures. But Philby leaves little doubt, in outlining the bitter clashes between the British and American planners of these forays, that the CIA finally engineered the destruction of the British-employed agents sent to the Ukraine, and then of the British-sponsored Ukrainian anti-Soviet leader, Stepan Bandera in West Germany.

Despite his mammoth outwitting and now exposure of the British Establishment, Philby curiously retains the admiration and affection of many who knew him — if Graham Greene’s preface to the book means anything. Philby evidently displayed all the best characteristics of a gentleman in British upper-class terms. Greene refers to "Philby’s enemies" (presumably the Establishment hard core) as though they are no friends of Greene either.

All this is an extraordinary achievement for one man who likes to sum himself up simply as a Soviet intelligence officer. It is therefore perhaps understandable that, in writing the book, his main worry seems to be that he won’t be believed. He is at pains to force those members of the Establishment who read his book (presumably they would rush it) to realise that one of themselves could consistently and successfully work to defeat them on the basis of the inherent weaknesses of their system.
Philby’s chosen career was due not to some degeneracy or greed but to decision to work for the Soviet Union as the “fortress” of communism; his success was due to his superior skill and his maintenance of all the mores of the British Establishment except the one most taken for granted — patriotism. The realisation of this must be shattering to many in British ruling circles even today. Superficially, Philby was a classic product of the “clever” wing of the Establishment, beginning with the permissible flirtation with the left at Cambridge. Later he took off for the Spanish Civil War . . . on Franco’s side, and in the pay of *The Times*. Natural—yet unnatural, for he was already a committed officer of Soviet intelligence.

He succeeded in entering the British secret service by invitation, having “dropped a few hints here and there” before heading for France as correspondent in October, 1939. By 1944, he was a senior secret service executive with a share in policy making.

Philby will not even allow unchallenged any suggestion that he might have had “divided” loyalties as a double agent. His remarkably successful career in the secret service was simply, to him, a “cover job” for his real service based on prior commitment to the Soviet Union.

Evidently by no means an uncritical Sovietophile, he indicates that he was shaken by Stalinist excesses. But he rejected the temptation to “give up” or to take the road of the “querulous outcasts of the Koestler-Crankshaw-Muggeridge variety, railing at the movement that had let me down — a ghastly fate, however lucrative it might have been.” Philby found that despite enormous errors by individual leaders, he prefers the people they lead to those of any other movement.

Why, then, didn’t Philby in the first place commit himself to work in the left political movement? His early disillusion with the British Labor Party could have been a normal spur to this. The answer could be in his shock that the “supposedly sophisticated electorate had been stampeded (in 1931) by the cynical propaganda of the day.” Philby could not find faith in the political potential of the British masses: perhaps this is why he became a Soviet agent instead of a British communist. There is a world of difference between the two.

**Alec Robertson**

**THE PUZZLED PATRIOTS,**
$6.75.

MUCH PAINSTAKING RESEARCH has gone into this completely objective account of the arrest and internment, during World War II, of a small group of Australian-born citizens, suspected by Military Intelligence of conspiring to help the Japanese aggressors. Most were members of the Australia First movement, whose leading figure was P. R. (Inky) Stephensen.

Stephensen edited a monthly periodical, *The Publicist*, founded in 1936 by W. J. Miles, a well-to-do public accountant and company director. The editorial policy of *The Publicist* was proclaimed in the first issue: “No writer will be a writer for this paper unless he stands definitely for Australia First.” An intense dislike, shared by Miles and Stephensen, for all things British, rather than any great love of country, inspired the slogan, “Australia First.”

The philosophy espoused by *The Publicist* was a crude, narrow, chauvinistic Australian nationalism, with anti-British, anti-semitic, anti-communist, and pro-fascist overtones. In May 1937, when the organised labor
movement, recognizing the inherent danger to Australia's future security involved in Japan's undeclared war against China, was demanding a boycott of Japanese goods, Stephensen wrote in *The Publicist*: "I say let the Japanese have a free hand in China." Six months later he returned to this theme, writing it is "far better that Australia should ride with Japan in the Pacific than decline with Britain in the Atlantic."

From 1938 *The Publicist* began reprinting Hitler's speeches. At this stage W. J. Miles, Stephensen and the group centred on *The Publicist* were not alone in their pro-axis sympathies. The Prime Minister to be, Robert Gordon Menzies, had openly expressed his admiration for both Mussolini and Hitler. As Attorney-General in the Lyons' Ministry, he framed coercive measures to compel Port Kembla waterside workers to load scrap metal into the *Dalfram* bound for Japan. When war eventuated R. G. Menzies put his pro-Axis sympathies in the background and donned the mantle of patriot.

Had P. R. Stephensen and his associates done likewise they may have avoided their subsequent fate. The Communist Party, which spearheaded the opposition to war and fascism, consistently denounced the activities of Stephensen and *The Publicist*. In April 1939 Stephensen took out a libel action against the Communist *Workers' Weekly*, arising from an article and a poster stating "Sydney's Nazi Underworld." Stephensen complained that he was portrayed as a paid traitor and agent of another nation. The *Workers' Weekly*, represented by Mr. Clive Evatt, pleaded in defence that the article was true, was published in the public benefit and was fair comment on a matter of public interest. The jury found for Stephensen, but awarded the insulting damages of one farthing.

Within three years Stephensen had been taken into custody at the instigation of Military Police Intelligence and interned for reasons substantially the same as alleged by the *Workers' Weekly*. To this extent the Communist Party and the *Workers' Weekly* can justifiably claim foresight. The same applies to those workers who demonstrated violently against the Adyar Hall meeting of the Australia First movement in February 1942, when Japanese bombs were already falling on Darwin. However, the authorities, instead of clamping down on Stephensen and his pro-Axis supporters, took action against the real patriots, his bitter opponents. James McLoughlin, a waterside worker, and Andrew Dove, a laborer, were arrested, charged and convicted of offensive behavior.

Impetus for the Sydney round-up of Australia Firsters came from Perth, in a coded telegram from Colonel H. D. Moseley, staff officer in charge of Army Intelligence, Western Command. Colonel Moseley's message to Army Intelligence authorities in Sydney was based on the detention of four persons in Perth, under section 13 of the National Security Act. Their detention was instigated by Detective-Sergeant G. R. Richards, who was then in charge of the Special (political) Bureau of the Perth CIB. Richards subsequently rose to the post of Deputy Director of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation. He played a prominent role in the notorious Petrov provocation, staged against the labor movement by R. G. Menzies on the eve of the 1954 Federal elections. Richards based his allegations against the four WA detainees on reports furnished by a paid agent, Frederick James Thomas. None of the four Westralians had any firm affiliations with *The Publicist* group in Sydney, although two of them had sent letters. All the evidence points to Thomas, who was paid £5
a week by Richards, acting as an agent provocateur; as defence counsel for the four put it, "No Thomas, no conspiracy."

Some of the most lurid and sensational evidence provided by Richards and Thomas in the conspiracy trial formed the main content of Colonel Moseley's telegram to Sydney.

The officer who would normally have had responsibility for acting on the Perth message was Lieutenant-Colonel J. M. Prentice. In civilian life, Prentice had been a radio commentator on foreign affairs over station 2UW in Sydney and a contributor to the Cheesecake magazine *Man*. In his speeches and writings, Prentice pursued a bitterly anti-communist, strongly pro-appeasement line. An issue of *Man* had to be recast in September 1939 and a radio commentary cancelled in which Prentice explained Germany would not go to war. However, in the absence of Prentice, for whom it must surely have created some embarrassment, the Perth message went to former advertising agent Lieutenant-Colonel Reginald Powell for action.

Author Bruce Muirden relates how Powell, accompanied by other members of army and military police intelligence, went to the Intelligence index, which listed the names of 60 members and sympathisers of the Australia First Movement. From this index, Major Tyrrell chose 20 names, four of which were struck off by Lieutenant-Colonel Powell.

No clear reason was ever established as to the grounds on which the 20 were selected or on what grounds the four were reprieved. It seems from subsequent proceedings that the choice, to a great degree, was purely arbitrary. In the cooler atmosphere of the post-war years, when the incident was reviewed in retrospect by a Commission of Inquiry, headed by Mr. Justice Clyne, it was found that eight of the internees had been unjustifiably detained. Mr. Justice Clyne recommended to the Government that they be awarded compensation.

The most significant aspect of the whole incident, which provides grounds for serious thought today, is the amount of power wielded by the so-called security forces. Secret police spying on the peace, democratic, student and labor movements, is on a much vaster scale than it was in the mid-war period. So much so that one State Premier can claim to have access to dossiers on 16,000 people, as compared with the 60 names available to Lieutenant-Colonel Powell in 1942.

Furthermore, repressive amendments to the Defence Act have established a death penalty for treason not only to Australia, but some foreign power, proclaimed to be Australia's friend and ally.

The author may not agree with his conclusion, since he states at the end of his book that he leaves the answers to questions raised therein to others. He states that he has attempted to follow Dr. Elton's precept, which regards it as an error to "study the past for the light it throws on the present." Be that as it may, the reader will find plenty of material for serious thought about issues which loom large today, such as freedom of conscience, freedom to oppose government policy on foreign affairs. The broader question of what justified the exercise of such freedom and what justifies its restraint, is outside the scope of the author's work. Nevertheless it is sure to stimulate some deeper thought on these currently important topics. It is a book to be commended to all students and others interested in Australian history.

E. W. CAMPBELL
Conference of the Left

ALR is pleased to publish the initial announcement by sponsors of a conference of left and anti-establishment forces.

ALR was one of a number of journals invited to express opinions on this project. The Editorial Board expresses support and will be undertaking a number of projects through its pages which it believes will stimulate discussion on important issues for the left to consider.

Many Australians are discontented with the condition of society today, and their number is growing. This discontent is wide-ranging and deep. Its range includes

- The economic set-up with its inequalities, injustices, and the uncontrolled power over people’s lives centred in the controllers of private corporations and government bureaucracies.

- Encroachments upon civil liberties inherent in the existing political structure and control.

- The quality of life in a society manipulated by private and government controllers whose values are essentially commercialised and profit-directed.

- A false order of national priorities, which is alienating national resources to foreign and Australian monopoly corporations, and subordinating education, cultural standards, health and other services to the interests of investors and to ever-increasing military spending.

- Foreign and defence policies that have already embroiled Australia in the unjust war of aggression against the Vietnamese people and will continue the nation on a collision course with the forces of national liberation in Asia and elsewhere.

- The condition of the oppressed Aboriginal minority, the conservative policies towards New Guinea’s independence, and the depressed status of many immigrants in our society.
• The great and growing gap between the Establishment's expressed ideals and moral values, on the one hand, and the realities of society on the other.

These and other issues confronting Australians find expression in many movements of action and protest, including the continuing struggle of industrial and white collar workers and unions; defence of civil liberties; the peace movement in opposition to the Vietnam war; the fight of Aborigines and their supporters for land, equal wages and rights; the actions of teachers and students for education reform, and many others. Activists in these movements are realising that radical social change is essential.

Believing this, the undersigned have agreed jointly to sponsor a conference of left and anti-establishment forces in Australia in the first half of 1969. Our purpose is to provide a forum for an exchange between all the different views opposed to the existing social system and establishment policies in Australia.

The conference would aim to provide a platform for all parties, organisations, trends and individuals opposed to the structure, policies and values of our society, challenging them all to move from generalities to propose concepts of how to effect radical social change.

We believe that such a conference can be both dialogue and preparation for more effective counter-action by the left. We would hope that all concerned with these issues would participate.

We will meet before the end of the year to consider the conference in detail—its date, venue, structure and preparation. In the meantime, we invite all interested political parties, trade unions, organisations, groups and individuals to express their opinions to the sponsors. All interested people should either write to the Conference Committee, C/- Box A247, Sydney South Post Office, 2000, or contact any individual sponsor whose name appears over the page:
QUEENSLAND:
Mrs. Norma Chalmers, 390 Manly Road, Manly, 4179.
Dave Guthrie, Box 90, University of Queensland, 4067.
Alice Hughes, 15 Meecham Street, Grange, 4051.
Brian Laver, 124 Whitmore Street, Taringa, 4066.
Alec Macdonald, Trades Hall, Brisbane, 4000.
Frank Nolan, Trades Hall, Brisbane, 4000.
Dan O'Neill, Box 90, University of Queensland, 4067.
Mitch Thomson, 124 Whitmore Street, Taringa, 4066.
Peter Wertheim, Philosophy Dept., University of Q'land, 4067.

NEW SOUTH WALES AND A.C.T.:
Laurie Aarons, 168 Day Street, Sydney, 2000.
Tassie Bull, 33 Grosvenor Street, Woollahra, 2025.
Rowan Cahill, 36 Wangoola Street, Gordon, 2072.
Norm Docker, 52 Phillip Street, Sydney, 2000.
Miss Flo Davis, 25 West Street, Petersham, 2049.
Robin Gollan, 10 Pelsart Street, Red Hill, A.C.T., 2603.
Ray Miller, C/- Trades Hall, Newcastle, 2300.
Dick Scott, 126 Chalmers Street, Surry Hills, 2010.
Dick Thompson, 64 Cliff Road, Epping, 2121.
Andrew Watson, 34A Miriam Road, Denistone, 2114.

VICTORIA:
John Arrowsmith, Box 135, 141 Nicholson Street, Carlton, 3053.
Laurie Carmichael, 174 Victoria Pde., East Melbourne, 3002.
Alastair Davidson, Dept. of Politics, Monash University, 3168.
Doug Kirsner, 28 Spray Street, Elwood, 3184.
John Playford, Dept. of Politics, Monash University, 3168.
Ian Turner, 205 Lennox Street, Richmond, 3121.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA:
Peter O'Brien, C/- The Union, University of Adelaide, 5000.
Howard O'Neill, 15 Flinders Street, Adelaide, 5000.
Mick Tsounis, 39 Malpas Street, Rostrevor, 5073.
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